

cop. 2

4-1-40

SUPPLEMENTAL IRRIGATION:

PROFIT-MAKER OR LOAD-BUILDER

A Study for
Rural Electrification Administration

by Robert J. M. Matteson

made under the general supervision of
H. S. Person, Consulting Economist
and the immediate supervision of
Robert T. Beall, Economist

June, 1939

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
Library

1914
The following is a list of the
names of the persons who
were present at the
meeting of the
Board of Directors
of the
Company held on
the 10th day of
January, 1914.

1914

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>		
CHAPTER VI. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS		62
	Page	
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64	1
A. The Present Situation	83	1
B. A Suggested REA Program	94	3
CHAPTER VII. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	117	
INTRODUCTION	117	1
CHAPTER I. THE EAST NEEDS IRRIGATION	118	3
A. General Shortage of Moisture	119	3
B. Over-Long Space Between Rains	120	4
C. Rains of Wrong Type	121	5
D. Absence of Rain at "Critical Periods"	121	6
CHAPTER II. IMPROVED CROPS	122	7
A. Crop Insurance	123	7
B. Larger Crops	124	8
C. Better Quality Crops	125	9
D. More Crops Per Season	126	10
E. Miscellaneous Advantages	127	10
CHAPTER III. HEAVIER LOAD	128	12
A. Electricity Vs. Gasoline	129	13
B. Electricity in Use	130	18
C. Irrigation As REA Load	131	33
CHAPTER IV. OPTIMUM CONDITIONS	132	45
A. Proper Water Supply Available	133	45
B. Proper Soil and Terrain	134	48
C. Proper Plants Grown	135	49
D. Income Exceeds Expenditure	136	50
CHAPTER V. IRRIGATION METHODS	137	52
A. Over-all Irrigation Characteristics	138	52
B. Subsurface Irrigation	139	54
C. Spray Irrigation	140	55
D. Surface Irrigation	141	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	
I	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....
1	A. The Present Situation.....
2	B. A Suggested REA Program.....
1	INTRODUCTION.....
2	CHAPTER I. THE EAST NEEDS IRRIGATION.....
2	A. General Shortage of Moisture.....
4	B. Over-Long Space Between Rainfall.....
5	C. Rains of Wrong Type.....
6	D. Absence of Rain at "Critical Periods".....
7	CHAPTER II. IMPROVED CROPS.....
7	A. Crop Insurance.....
8	B. Larger Crops.....
9	C. Better Quality Crops.....
10	D. More Crops Per Season.....
10	E. Miscellaneous Advantages.....
12	CHAPTER III. HEAVIER LOAD.....
13	A. Electricity vs. Gasoline.....
15	B. Electricity in Use.....
17	C. Irrigation As REA Load.....
42	CHAPTER IV. OPTIMUM CONDITIONS.....
42	A. Proper Water Supply Available.....
48	B. Proper Soil and Terrain.....
49	C. Proper Plants Grown.....
50	D. Income Weeds Expenditures.....
52	CHAPTER V. IRRIGATION METHODS.....
52	A. Over-all Irrigation Characteristics.....
54	B. Subsurface Irrigation.....
55	C. Spray Irrigation.....
58	D. Surface Irrigation.....

E. Porous Hose Irrigation.....	60
CHAPTER VI. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	62
1. <u>AN</u> A. Installation Costs.....	64
B. Operation Charges.....	70
C. Installing and Operating Small Unit.....	83
D. Gross and Net Returns.....	94
2. <u>Development of the Porous Hose Method of Irrigation in Michigan.</u>	
CHAPTER VII. PROBABLE DEVELOPMENTS.....	117
3. <u>Also</u> A. Present Extent.....	117
B. Favorable Factors.....	118
C. Sectional Development.....	119
4. <u>Also</u> D. Distributional Techniques.....	119
E. Other Developments.....	120
Oregon State Agricultural College, Sta. Bulletin 277, May 1931.	
CHAPTER VIII. AN REA PROGRAM.....	121
5. <u>Farm Irrigation Planning Systems.</u> By Smith, L. J., and Garver, P.	
A. Further Research.....	121
B. Systems to Emphasize.....	122
C. Literature.....	122
6. <u>Card</u> D. Purchasing.....	123
E. Miscellaneous.....	123
1935.	
7. <u>Irrigated Gardens.</u> * * * * * Graves, Harry A., North Dakota Agricultural College, Circular 161, March, 1938.	
8. <u>Irrigated Pastures for Winter Cattle.</u> Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Station Bulletin 264, May 1930.	
9. <u>Irrigating a One-acre Garden.</u> By Petty, Ralph L., South Dakota State College Extension Service, Extension Leaflet 366, June 1937.	
10. <u>Electricity on the Farm and in Rural Communities.</u> C.R.S.A. Bulletin, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 223.	
11. <u>Irrigation as Crop Insurance.</u> by Bell, Clive C., Rural Electrification Engineer, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, June 21-24, 1937.	
12. <u>Irrigation Demands in Indiana in 1936.</u> Shipman, R. C., Talk at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, November, 1936.	

60	E. Porous Hose Installation.....
62	CHAPTER VI. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS.....
64	A. Installation Costs.....
70	B. Operation Charges.....
83	C. Installing and Operating Small Unit.....
94	D. Gross and Net Returns.....
117	CHAPTER VII. PROBABLE DEVELOPMENTS.....
117	A. Present Extent.....
118	B. Possible Factors.....
119	C. Sectional Development.....
119	D. Distinctive Techniques.....
120	E. Other Developments.....
121	CHAPTER VIII. AN REA PROGRAM.....
121	A. Further Research.....
122	B. Systems to Emphasize.....
122	C. Literature.....
123	D. Purchasing.....
123	E. Miscellaneous.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. An Effective Portable Spray Irrigation Layout, by Staebner, F. E., United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Engineering. *Bulletin No. 46*, December 1936, p. 5.
2. Development of the Porous Hose Method of Irrigation in Michigan, by Robey, O. E., *Agricultural Engineering*, 1934, p. 282.
3. Electric Power For Irrigation In Humid Regions, C.R.E.A. Bulletin, Vol. VII, No. 2.
4. Preliminary Report on Effect of Irrigation on Major Berry Crops in the Willamette Valley, Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Sta. Bulletin 277, May 1931.
5. Farm Irrigation Pumping Systems, by Smith, L. J., and Garver, Harry L., State College of Washington, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 311, May 1935.
6. Garden Irrigation, Molenaar, Aldert, Nebraska Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Cir. 746, 1935.
7. Irrigated Gardens, by Farmer, W. H., and Graves, Harry A., North Dakota Agricultural College, Circular 161, March, 1938.
8. Irrigated Pastures for Dairy Cattle, Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Station Bulletin 264, May 1930.
9. Irrigating a One-Acre Garden, by Patty, Ralph L., South Dakota State College Extension Service, Extension Leaflet 366, June 1937.
10. Electricity on the Farm and in Rural Communities, C.R.E.A. Bulletin, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 222.
11. Irrigation as Crop Insurance, by Bell, Clive C., Rural Electrification Engineer, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, June 21-24, 1937.
12. Irrigation Demands in Indiana in 1936, Shipman, R. C., Talk at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, November, 1936.
13. Q.R.E.A. Farm Letter, issued by Committee on the Relation of Electricity to Agriculture, #27, June 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. An Effective Variable Soil Irrigation Layout, by Woodman, F. E., United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Engineering.
2. Development of the Potable Water Supply of Washington in 1934, by Roney, O. E., Agricultural Engineering, 1934, p. 238.
3. Electric Power and Irrigation in Great Britain, C.A.S.A. Bulletin, Vol. VII, No. 8.
4. Principles of Soil Irrigation as Applied to the Valley of the Willamette, Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Corvallis, 1931, May 1931.
5. Water Irrigation Engineering Systems, by Smith, L. J., and Graven, Harry L., State College of Washington, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 211, May 1932.
6. Garden Irrigation, Holman, Albert, Nebraska Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Circular 145, 1932.
7. Irrigated Gardens, by Timmer, W. E., and Graven, Harry A., North Dakota Agricultural College, Circular 161, March, 1932.
8. Irrigated Gardens for Water Control, Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Corvallis Bulletin 264, May 1930.
9. Irrigation in One-Acre Gardens, by Roney, Ralph L., South Dakota State College Extension Service, Extension Circular 300, June 1937.
10. Electricity on the Farm and in Rural Communities, C.A.S.A. Bulletin, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 123.
11. Irrigation as a Crop Insurance, by Hall, Olive C., Rural Electrification Administration, Economic Public Service Corporation, June 21-24, 1937.
12. Irrigation Systems in India in 1935, Phipps, R. C., Talk at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, November, 1938.

13. Irrigation for Vegetable Crops in Iowa, by Erwin, A. T. and Haber, E. S., Agricultural Experiment Station, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Bulletin No. 308, March 1934.
14. Irrigation in Humid Climates, King, Frankline Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
15. Irrigation in Humid States is Good Insurance For Fruit or Truck Crops, United States Department of Agriculture, October, 1936.
16. Irrigation in Western Washington, Pub. by the Agricultural Engineering Department of the Puget Sound Power and Light Co.
17. Irrigation Power Load in Northern Ohio, by Hinton, R. C., of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, November 1936.
18. Irrigation Systems and Their Application, by Schaenzer, J. P., January 1938.
19. Minnesota's Irrigation Problem, by Roe, H. B., Agricultural Engineering News Letter, #73, April 1938.
20. Pasture Irrigation, by Smith, L. J., Grunder, Maynard S. and Garver, Harry L. State College of Washington, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 313, May 1935.
21. Porous Hose Irrigation, by Robey, O. E., Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, Extension Bulletin 133, Reprint, June 1934.
22. Sprinkler Irrigation, by Price, F. E., Agricultural Engineer, Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, May 1932.
23. Low-Pressure Sprinkler Irrigation, by Duffee, F. W., Agricultural Engineering, March 1939, p. 97.
24. More Strawberries, by Ferguson, R. S., 1937.
25. Nature's Method of Irrigation, pamphlet.
26. Spinach Under Irrigation in Texas, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Circular #66, November 1932.
27. C.R.E.A. News Letter, issued by Committee on the Relation of Electricity to Agriculture, #17, June 1938.

13. Investigation for Vegetable Crops in Iowa, by Davis, A. T. and Haber, E. S., Agricultural Experiment Station, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Bulletin No. 308, March 1934.
14. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
15. Investigation in Field Diseases as Good Insurance for Crops of Iowa, Crook, United States Department of Agriculture, October, 1930.
16. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
17. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
18. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
19. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
20. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
21. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
22. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
23. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
24. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
25. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
26. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.
27. Investigation in Field Diseases, King, Franklin Hiram, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 46, December 1896, p. 3.

28. Sprinkler Irrigation on Vegetable Farms in New Jersey, by Huber, H. F., Gross, A. F. and Lucas, D. C., New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 453, November 1927.
29. Subirrigation for Gardens, Issued by The Extension Service, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas and The United States Department of Agriculture, B-92, 1936.
30. Agricultural Engineering, June 1939, p. 237.
31. Supplemental Irrigation in the Eastern United States of America, by Staebner, F. E., Reprint from Vol. B. of the Transactions of the 6th Commission of the International Society of Soil Science, Meeting in Zurich, 1937.
32. Surface Irrigation in the Eastern States, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 1635.
33. Supplemental Irrigation in the Eastern States, by Staebner, F. E., Bureau of the Agricultural Engineering, U.S.D.A., October 1936.
34. Possibilities and Need of Supplemental Irrigation in the Humid Region, by Williams, Milo B., Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, 1911, p. 309.
35. Twenty-five Years of Supplemental Irrigation Investigations in Willamette Valley, Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State Agricultural College, Stat. Bulletin 302, June 1932.
36. Using Porous Hose in High Row Crops, by Robey, O. C., Michigan Quarterly Bulletin, May 1935.

(Also correspondence with Overholt, Robey, Chipman, Staebner and others).

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

2. The second of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

3. The third of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

4. The fourth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

5. The fifth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

6. The sixth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

7. The seventh of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

8. The eighth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

9. The ninth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

10. The tenth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent, and that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. THE PRESENT SITUATION: Supplemental irrigation east of the 100th meridian has many potentialities for enlarging farm incomes and building load for REA projects. Though there are very few installations at present, agricultural trends indicate considerable development within the next decade.

1. The consistent failure of natural rainfall to give maximum crops is the basic reason for irrigation in the humid states. Among the chief factors behind this failure are the following: drought years when total moisture is not sufficient, frequency of over-long periods between rains, the numerous rains which are largely ineffective for crop-watering because they come too suddenly and too weakly, the unlikelihood of their being natural moisture at every critical period of plant growth.

2. When crops have plentiful moisture regardless of precipitation, their grower receives certain advantages over the non-irrigating farmer. His crops are insured against drought, and they are likely to be both larger and better in quality. More than that, more crops per season are likely and there are certain miscellaneous benefits: chemical and bacterial action of soil accelerated, "caking" is checked, pests and diseases are hindered and some systems give frost protection.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
The research and development department is responsible for the design and development of new products and processes. It is the primary source of new ideas and is responsible for the feasibility studies and the design of new products and processes. The department is also responsible for the development of new manufacturing processes and for the improvement of existing processes.

2. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
The research and development department is responsible for the design and development of new products and processes. It is the primary source of new ideas and is responsible for the feasibility studies and the design of new products and processes. The department is also responsible for the development of new manufacturing processes and for the improvement of existing processes.

3. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
The research and development department is responsible for the design and development of new products and processes. It is the primary source of new ideas and is responsible for the feasibility studies and the design of new products and processes. The department is also responsible for the development of new manufacturing processes and for the improvement of existing processes.

3. Supplemental irrigation could use a tremendous amount of electrical current, the potential national load being 7.5 billion kwh per year and potential AAA project load being 6.5 million kwh per year. Electric pumping at moderate rates is preferable to gas-engine installations. The average crop-watering unit will require a 3hp motor and about 500 kwh of current per season. The mid-west and mid Atlantic states are best suited to supplemental irrigation development.

4. Various conditions -- besides rainfall inadequacy -- must exist wherever supplemental irrigation is advisable. Most important of these conditions are: ample water supply, proper soil and terrain, "water-requiring" crops, an excess of income over outgo.

5. There are nine methods of supplemental irrigation: sub-surface, overhead sprinkler, portable sprinkler, revolving sprinkler, perforated pipe, porous hose, furrow, border and flood. Selection of the proper system depends upon such factors as: crops, terrain, soil, etc. No matter what technique is used, some things are always necessary: pump, piping, motor, etc.

6. Supplemental irrigation is financially feasible for most growers. Installation and operation costs are high, but the large returns more than make up for this expense. Operating costs per acre-inch of delivered water decrease as plots are larger and total volume of water, greater. The average grower receives a net increase in income of about \$30 per season from applying supplemental crop-water.

7. Though supplemental irrigation is at present little used, the coming intensification of agriculture and the continuing downward tendency in rainfall indicates grounds for expansion. The two systems which will likely be used most -- because they combine efficiency with economy -- are porous hose and revolving sprinkler. Other probable trends are: "package" merchandizing of small-scale irrigation equipment, increase in crop watering done at night with off-peak current, a large expansion in the field of the suburban or "side-line" kitchen-garden installations.

B. A SUGGESTED REA PROGRAM. To get for its projects any of the vast potential load that would come from wide acceptance of supplemental, REA must carry on an active "campaign" of research and selling. The details of such a program will involve considerable planning by the Utilization Division, but it is possible to foresee certain basic essentials.

1. More research into personal feasibility and load possibilities is necessary before a large-scale "selling" effort can be inaugurated. Several sample installations should be installed immediately and records kept of cost, consumption, returns, etc. Scientific "test-plot" investigations might be conducted by other Department of Agriculture agencies or by REA with NYA labor.

2. The initial emphasis should be upon small, kitchen-garden installations and upon inexpensive but serviceable systems like

7. The primary purpose of this report is to provide information on the results of the investigation of the activities of the [redacted] in the [redacted] area. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report.

8. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report.

9. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report.

10. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted by the [redacted] and the [redacted] and the results are presented in this report. The investigation was conducted from [redacted] to [redacted] and the results are presented in this report.

- 4 -

porous hose and revolving sprinkler. Small installations are easier to "sell" and will provide their own sales talk for eventual larger units. The two systems suggested are more universally usable than any others and also can be bought as "package" merchandize.

3. REA should put out leaflets, flyers, "News" articles, etc. concerning the advantages of supplemental irrigation. The campaign would also be forwarded by a manual for project superintendents similar to that put out for the "Electric Brooder" drive.

4. Many members should be given initial financial aid to install crop-water pumping systems. This might be done through project loans of the wiring type or through EFMA assistance. Borrowers should be advised to practice cooperative buying.

5. Several miscellaneous points should be kept in mind. Field representatives should "play up" supplemental irrigation. Other Department of Agriculture agencies should cooperate in the campaign. In the beginning certain trial areas should be selected for intensive selling.

... and the
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

INTRODUCTION

Small-scale, separate-farm irrigation throughout the humid East -- neglected till recently in the preoccupation with the large-scale, collective Western variety -- decidedly enlarges both rural incomes and electrical consumption.

Supplemental irrigation -- so-called because it represents water in addition to rainfall -- means larger and better quality crops. Plentiful soil moisture -- needed especially by various fruits and garden vegetables -- is sustained during dry spells and at "critical periods" of plant growth. Not unusual is the experience of an Iowa grower who received 21.8 pounds of tomatoes per unirrigated plant and 44.4 pounds per irrigated.

To rural electric distribution lines offering reasonable rates, supplemental irrigation means a larger and better balanced power load. Energy for water-pumping, an essential of nearly every irrigation layout, is supplied more cheaply by electricity at \$.02 per kwh and below than by the more commonly used gasoline. R. E. Horton, the eminent hydrologist, estimates that electric-pumping irrigation would consume 7,500,000,000 kwh every year if used on one-half the humid-state acreage needing and susceptible to supplemental water. He suggests, moreover, that much of this consumption could be off-peak since irrigation is not only a summer undertaking but also one well adapted to night operation.

Because supplemental irrigation does increase both crop returns

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of research in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) and its applications. This document is intended for researchers, students, and professionals interested in the latest developments in AI technology.

The report is organized into several sections. The first section discusses the historical context and the evolution of AI. The second section explores the various sub-fields of AI, including machine learning, natural language processing, and computer vision. The third section focuses on the practical applications of AI in different industries, such as healthcare, finance, and manufacturing. The fourth section addresses the ethical and social implications of AI, and the fifth section provides a conclusion and future outlook.

In the first section, we review the early milestones of AI, from the Turing Test to the development of the first AI programs. We then discuss the resurgence of AI in the late 20th century, driven by advances in computing power and the availability of large datasets.

The second section delves into the core components of AI. Machine learning, in particular, has become a dominant force in the field, enabling systems to learn from data and make predictions. Natural language processing (NLP) has made significant strides in understanding and generating human language. Computer vision has enabled machines to interpret visual information, a task that was once considered a hallmark of human intelligence.

The third section examines the diverse applications of AI. In healthcare, AI is used for medical diagnosis, drug discovery, and patient care. In finance, it powers algorithmic trading and risk management. In manufacturing, AI optimizes production processes and quality control. These examples illustrate the wide-ranging impact of AI on modern society.

The fourth section addresses the ethical and social challenges posed by AI. Issues such as privacy, security, and the potential for job displacement are discussed. We also explore the importance of transparency and accountability in AI systems, and the need for robust regulatory frameworks to ensure the responsible use of this technology.

In conclusion, the report highlights the remarkable progress made in AI and the vast potential for future discoveries. It emphasizes the need for continued research and collaboration across disciplines to fully realize the benefits of AI while mitigating its risks. The future of AI is bright, and its impact on the world will continue to grow.

We sincerely hope that this presentation may lead the organization to make more serious utilization efforts in the supplemental irrigation field. Such efforts would assist the farmers in using their electricity productively, as well as assist the cooperatives in repaying REA.

I. THE EAST NEEDS IRRIGATION

The consistent failure of natural rainfall to give maximum crops is the basic reason for irrigation in the humid states. According to a table prepared by O. E. Robey of the Michigan Extension Service, only sixteen of the last seventy-five years have approached giving the twelve inches of water necessary between May 1 and September 1 for moderately good production. Even in seasons with high total fall, there may be several rainless periods longer than a week with resulting damage to various susceptible plants. Sometimes otherwise sufficient and evenly distributed rainfall, fails at certain "critical periods" of plant growth. The several extremely severe droughts of this decade are responsible for much of the current interest in the topic.

A. GENERAL SHORTAGE OF MOISTURE

Maximum crops -- and consequently the maximum income from a farmer's expenditure of labor and money -- are obviously not possible when the total moisture available during a growing season is not sufficient for unstunted growth. In the humid territory East of the 100th meridian, as well as in the arid West, this is frequently the case as Robey's figures have already suggested. Such a lack of moisture exists when the entire year is dry or when

little water is available from May to September.

Various statements, gleaned from numerous articles on the subject, show that the frequent absence of adequate annual rainfall is no fanciful theory. An orchardist in Michigan states that "three years out of five lack enough rain to grow satisfactory apples." A study by Clive C. Bell, Rural Electrification Engineer of the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, revealed that, during the six years beginning with 1930, sixteen Wisconsin counties averaged only one year with near-sufficient rainfall. A comprehensive rainfall and run-off survey conducted by the Department of Interior shows a marked trend towards lower average annual precipitation and particularly lower average May-to-September precipitation throughout a good share of the humid region.

B. OVER-LONG SPACE BETWEEN RAINS

More important and consistent than general moisture shortage, as a factor in rainfall's inadequacy, is the length of periods between satisfactory rains. Studies conducted by the Office of Experiment Stations and by O. E. Robey reveal that every growing season contains several rainless stretches, of ten days or more duration, which can be decidedly detrimental to certain crops. Because of that condition supplemental irrigation can be an income-raising investment in wet years as well as dry.

...as well as the ...

There are many concrete statements by farmers and experts to back up the above analysis. Clive C. Bell, cited earlier, states that most Wisconsin farmers affirm that "There's at least one period during every growing season when an inch or more of water would mean a bigger and better crop." A chart compiled by Robey shows that 1928, to pick a typical "normal" summer, has three ten-day-plus rainless stretches as follows: June 6-9, July 1-14, August 3-19. By considering days after a fortnight without an inch of rain as harmfully dry, Milo B. Williams, a Department of Agriculture investigator, estimated that there were forty days per average humid-area growing season when supplemental irrigation would be beneficial.

C. RAINS OF WRONG TYPE

Besides inadequacies due to long-run shortage or poor distribution, rainfall also falls short of maximum water contribution to plant growth because it frequently comes too suddenly or too weakly. "A dashing rain, according to Robey, though amounting to three-fourths of an inch or more has a high percentage of run-off and little penetration on the high land where it is most needed." On the other hand, a gentle rain of one-fourth inch or less does not have enough volume for sufficient penetration. Since a large portion of the summer moisture comes either as a driving or gentle rain, irrigation can be needed even

when records of amount and timeliness indicate perfect rainfall conditions.

D. ABSENCE OF RAIN AT "CRITICAL PERIODS"

If rainfall were uniformly excellent in intensity, as well as general plentitude and well-spaced distribution, it still might be advantageous to supplement it because of the added moisture desirable at certain "critical periods" of crop growth. This fact is further reason for stating that humid-area irrigation can benefit growers of several particularly susceptible plants even in years of optimum natural moisture conditions.

The "critical periods" come at various intervals in the life of various crops. Generally speaking, however, germination, transplantation, and filling out are the times when the most water is required. Suggestions in Farmer's Bulletin #1635 indicate the "critical periods" for several plants: "field corn, one irrigation at ear-setting stage; sweet potatoes, one irrigation when vines start and one or two a fortnight before harvesting; strawberries, once every three days at time of fruiting."

II. IMPROVED CROPS

The inadequacies of natural rainfall, then, are the reasons for supplemental irrigation. When crops have plentiful moisture regardless of precipitation, their grower receives certain advantages over the non-irrigating farmer. He no longer fears the perpetual scepter of drought disaster. His harvest is larger, of better quality, and more lucrative. He may be able to grow two crops instead of one. Those benefits and others are the subject of this section.

A. CROP INSURANCE

Supplemental irrigation insures the farmer's crops against failures due to general moisture shortage or ill-distributed rainfall. The operating costs of the installation -- including charges for interest and depreciation -- represent the rate which the farmer has to pay for that insurance. For a service, such as this, which may prevent hundreds or thousands of dollars loss, \$35.00 per acre per season -- a high estimate of average humid-area irrigation costs -- is certainly not an excessive payment.

Indeed that payment seems exceedingly low when one reads of irrigators making big profits while their neighbors' crops fail almost completely. Scott Martin of Pekin, Indiana, for example, not only secured 240 crates of strawberries per acre

[illegible]

in 1936 while his fellow-growers were averaging 41 crates, but also obtained a much higher percentage of top-grade fruits. An Ohio potato irrigator averaged 345 bushels per acre with 290 bushels being large, as contrasted to his neighbors 200 bushels average with 160 large.

B. LARGER CROPS

Expenditures for supplemental irrigation, however, result in the positive advantage of larger harvests as well as the negative benefit of drought insurance. The extent of the increase varies with the crop, the thoroughness of irrigation, the general cultivational practices. Sometimes the increase is so great as to make the per unit cost of the irrigated produce almost identical with that of the non-irrigated, thus in effect canceling out the additional expense.

A few examples selected from nation-wide reports of humid-region irrigation experiences will illustrate the general statements above. The per-acre yield of an Ohio orchard was 360 bushels on irrigated plots and 290 on unirrigated, the cost being \$.43 per bushel of irrigated fruit and \$.38 per bushel of non-irrigated. Beans, grown in the humid sections of Oregon, averages 10.32 tons per acre unirrigated and 15.23 tons per acre irrigated. An Iowa experiment showed that irrigated tomato production is 67.4 per cent greater than non-irrigated. Robey's investigations in Michigan revealed that porous-hose irrigation increased crop yields from

in 1945 with the following results: there were averaging 11 cwt per acre, but this was a low yield compared with the average of 20-30 cwt per acre in 1944. This potato irrigator averaged 345 bushels per acre with 190 bushels of seed, compared to the non-irrigated 200 bushels of seed.

Experiments for experimental irrigation, however, result in the positive advantage of larger investments as well as the negative benefit of drought insurance. The extent of the increase varies with the crop, the season, the season, the general cultivation practices. Sometimes the increase is as great as 50% and the per unit cost of the irrigated produce almost identical with that of the non-irrigated, but in other cases the cost of the irrigated produce is as high as 100% of the non-irrigated.

The per-acre yield of an 11.5 acre orchard was 300 bushels on irrigated plots and 100 on non-irrigated, the cost being \$4.43 per bushel of irrigated fruit and \$8.86 per bushel of non-irrigated. Grown in the same section of Oregon, averages 10.5 cwt per acre irrigated and 15.5 cwt per acre non-irrigated. An Iowa experiment showed that irrigated wheat produced 17.5 cwt per acre and non-irrigated 15.5 cwt per acre. The cost of irrigation was \$1.10 per acre and the cost of the irrigated wheat was \$1.10 per bushel.

50 to 200 per cent. The following table summarizes the results of twenty-five years of supplemental irrigation in a humid section of Oregon:

Oregon Irrigation

Crop	Trial period	Avg. irrigation (inches)	Yield Per Acre (T. or Bu.)			
			Not Irrigated	Irrigated	Gain per acre	Gain per acre in.
Alfalfa...	1909-32	10.50	3.62	5.83	2.21	0.21
Red Clover	1908-32	8.15	4.17	6.25	2.08	.26
Alsike....	1914-32	8.44	1.92	4.01	2.09	.25
Grass.....	1915-24	11.20	3.33	5.13	1.80	.16
Potatoes..	1907-32	4.12	134.00	192.92	58.92	14.30
Beans.....	1911-32	3.35	10.32	15.23	4.91	1.47
Corn.....	1907-32	5.80	6.47	8.93	2.46	.42
Kale.....	1911-14	4.33	10.61	13.95	3.34	.77
Beets.....	1908-14	4.50	10.98	15.61	4.63	1.03
Fibre Flox	1927-32	4.00	1.68	2.36	.68	.17
Gen.Av.....	---	6.44	---	---	---	---

C. BETTER QUALITY CROPS

Supplemental irrigation acts positively not only in enlarging crop yield but also in producing better quality crops. In the Ohio orchard cited above, irrigated apples were worth \$8.00 per bushel and unirrigated \$5.51. In the humid section of Washington, the average weight of cabbage heads from irrigated patches was 5.6 lbs., from unirrigated -- 3.5 lbs. Various potato growers in Michigan and Wisconsin have found that their production of number one has

$$\gamma_1 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_2 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_3 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_4 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_5 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_6 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_7 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_8 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_9 = 195.6 \text{ MeV} \quad \gamma_{10} = 195.6 \text{ MeV}$$

more than doubled, while number two yield has remained stationary and number three has diminished. Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely but those serve to make the point.

D. MORE CROPS PER SEASON

As well as fostering larger and better crops, supplemental irrigation also tends to produce more crops per season. One irrigator, for example, was able to have cabbage, spinach and lettuce from one planting; spinach, peppers and cauliflower from a second. A bulletin issued by the New Jersey experiment station reveals that 184 non-irrigating commercial vegetable growers average 1.5 crops per year on their entire acreage as contrasted with irrigating growers who average 1.9 crops per year.

E. MISCELLANEOUS ADVANTAGES

Besides the various benefits already mentioned, supplemental irrigation accomplishes other things. By providing plentiful soil moisture, it accelerates certain helpful chemical and bacterial activities within the soil. It softens clods and dissolves plant foods, thus checking unproductive "caking". According to W. L. Powers of Oregon State Agricultural College, "Humid-area irrigation is an aid to deep or early plowing, intensive cropping, and enables the operator to prepare the land for planting at any time."

There are several additional benefits associated with the "spray" irrigation technique. The spread of crop pests and diseases

may be checked by frequent washings with the supplemental water. Frost protection may be given by continuous watering when the temperature falls as much as five degrees below freezing.

These crop-improving contributions of supplemental irrigation, however, are a secondary reason for the interest in it. Being more than "just another technological trick", the practice has many other features -- and advantages -- making it pay for itself -- not only directly increasing crop yield and reducing considerably energy for the crop operation. One writer has already found that D. H. Norton who suggests -- gradually conservatively -- that supplemental irrigation might cost the grower \$10,000 -- a necessary cost of growing crop season.

It is a conclusion that as the grower would be far benefited if it were possible or profitable to power the electrical energy of the low-levels irrigation water which may even be installed. There are a few cases, however, where gravity can be utilized and many, where possible changes are also necessary. These irrigated plots which do have electric pumping consist of a relatively heavy amount of current -- likely around 1000 kw being about 1000 kw per acre per season.

Electricity as the energy for supplemental irrigation, then, will be the subject of this chapter. There will be sections devoted to electrical power's advantages over gasoline, the likely amount for water and current, the characteristics of Western irrigation

There is a large number of people who are interested in the history of the city and who are willing to contribute to the preservation of the old buildings. The city has a large number of people who are interested in the history of the city and who are willing to contribute to the preservation of the old buildings.

III. HEAVIER LOAD

Those crop-improving contributions of supplemental irrigation, however, are a somewhat indirect reason for its interest to REA. Being more than "just another cultivational skill", the practice not only adds to farm prosperity -- and consequent ability to pay for current -- but also directly increases load by demanding considerable energy for its own operation. Citation has already been made of R. E. Horton who suggests -- probably conservatively -- that supplemental irrigation might well require 16,000,000 horsepower of electricity per season.

Such a consumption as that suggested would be far exceeded if it were possible or profitable to power with electrical energy all the humid-area irrigation units which may some day be installed. There are a few cases, however, where gravity can be utilized and many, where gasoline engines are less expensive. Those irrigated plots which do have electric pumping consume a surprisingly heavy amount of current -- likely consumption being about 185 kwh per acre per season.

Electricity as the energy for supplemental irrigation, then, will be the subject of this chapter. There will be sections devoted to electrical power's advantages over gasoline, the likely demand for motors and current, the characteristics of Eastern irrigation

These crop-improving contributions of supplemental irrigation, however, are a somewhat indirect reason for its interest to W.A.A. being more than "just another civilizational skill," the practice not only adds to farm prosperity -- and consequently ability to pay for current -- but also directly increases land by demanding considerable energy for its own operation. Discussion has already been made of R. H. Horton who suggests -- probably -- that the power consumption of irrigation systems is not negligible. The horsepower of electricity per season.

Such a comparison as that suggested would be far exceeded if it were possible or profitable to power with electrical energy all the hand-operated irrigation units which may some day be installed. There are a few cases, however, where gravity can be utilized and many, where gasoline engines are less expensive. Those irrigated crops which do have electric pumping consume a surprisingly heavy amount of current -- likely consumption being about 150 kWh per acre per season.

Electricity as the energy for supplemental irrigation, then, will be the subject of this chapter. There will be sections devoted to electrical power's advantages over gasoline, the likely demand for motors and current, the characteristics of Western irrigation

as load for REA projects. Left to a later chapter, however, will be a proposed program by which REA might take advantage of this potential load.

A. ELECTRICITY VS. GASOLINE

Although electric motors for supplemental irrigation pumping tend to cost more than gasoline engines, electricity at moderate rates is likely to have various assets which outweigh that initial disadvantage. Therefore, to understand the relative merit of the two energies -- and consequently the service or disservice which REA would be doing farmers and itself by "pushing" humid-area irrigation -- it is necessary to analyze, also other factors besides initial expense. Among those "other factors" are: extra-irrigation uses for the motor, operating charges, and cost of maintenance.

1. INITIAL EXPENSE, which we analyze as the first factor, has already been termed higher for electric installations than for gas engines. This higher first cost springs from the necessity of stringing special lines to irrigation fields as well as from a differential in the price of motors.

a. Motor Costs. Within the "up-to-five-horsepower" range, which satisfies the horsepower requirements of most Eastern irrigation installations, electric motors are considerably more expensive than gasoline engines. In new models, the former cost

about 15 per cent more than the latter, with \$75 and \$66 respectively being likely prices for three horsepower units.

Another significant consideration is the ease and cheapness with which one can acquire rebuilt and second hand automobile motors -- desirable despite their over-heavy power capacities. As a note of general information it might be added that within the above-five-horsepower range -- where energy consumption is too heavy for most RRA facilities -- this cost differential tends to disappear and on new motors of higher horsepowers even to go the other way.

b. Wiring Costs. The special wiring which electric pumping irrigation may require is another reason why initial expenditures tend to be less for gasoline installations. O. E. Hobeys points out, for example, that "very often it is necessary to construct a power line some distance from the buildings to the source of water supply." Virgil Overholt, an Ohio authority, lists as a deterrent to more electrified installations the fact that "where portable irrigation is used the equipment must be changed from field according to the rotation." In the case of unusually large plots requiring higher horsepowers than single-phase lines can safely carry, there would be the additional necessity of substituting three-phase construction.

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

2. EXTRA-IRRIGATION USES for either a gasoline or electric motor are many. One of the assets counteracting electricity's higher initial cost, however, is the latter's probable adaptability to slightly more functions and its somewhat greater efficiency. In choosing a motor for irrigation, therefore, a farmer should place considerable weight on how many other uses -- such as threshing, insect spraying and plumbing system pumping -- will be given his new machinery.

This "other uses" angle of motor selection is especially significant to RIA. It means that supplemental irrigation besides being a load-builder and income-producer, is also directly related to various lines of present utilization efforts. It may be possible, for example, to sell a project member on plumbing and irrigation as inter-related benefits from one expenditure even though he might "balk" at accepting plumbing as an independent electrical use. Certainly a farmer who already has an electric motor for plumbing, feed grinding, etc. -- or a gasoline engine, for that matter -- should readily understand the wisdom of spending enough more to use the same motor in watering his crops.

3. OPERATING COSTS, representing another asset for an electric installation, are usually higher for gasoline engines.

... WITH-INITIALS FOR EITHER A SPECIFIC OR GEN-

ERIC MOTOR ARE MANY. ONE OF THE EARLY CONSIDERATIONS

TRICITY'S FIRST INITIAL COST, HOWEVER, IS THE LATTER'S PRO-

TABLE ABILITY TO ALIGHTLY MOVE INSTRUCTIONS AND THE

GREATER EFFICIENCY. IN CHOOSING A MOTOR FOR TRICITY, THERE-

... A MOTOR WHICH WOULD BE SUITABLE FOR TRICITY

OTHER USES -- SUCH AS TRICITY, TRICITY TRICITY AND TRICITY

SYSTEM TRICITY -- WILL BE GIVEN HIS NEW TRICITY.

THE "OTHER USES" TRICITY OF MOTOR TRICITY IS ESPECIALLY

TRICITY TO TRICITY. IT TRICITY THAT TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY A TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

3. OPERATING TRICITY, TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY TRICITY

Authorities are nearly unanimous in believing that electric motors deliver more water per horsepower-hour^{1/} than do internal combustion apparatuses. Though fuel charges -- electric current by kwh and gasoline by the gallon -- are sometimes higher per horsepower-hour on an electrified installation than on a gas-powered one, this better water-delivery efficiency of the electric motor nearly always results in the per-acre-inch cost of electricity being less than gasoline. Discussed briefly below are these two matters -- efficiency and rates -- which determine operating expenses.

a. Efficiency. The electric motor's water-delivery superiority over a gas engine of equal strength has several bases. Most important, it will maintain the high, constant speed which most pumps require for optimum operation. Secondly, its size is usually better adapted to the pump and required water volume than the gas engine which often has such excessive horsepower that fuel consumption is extra heavy and coordination with the pump is poor. Thirdly, the electric motor demands much less attendance and is considerably more dependable than the internal combustion apparatus.

b. Fuel Charges. Until the price of electricity exceeds 2.5¢ per kwh, electric pumping is likely to be less expensive

^{1/} Horsepower-hour -- a unit for applying the same time conditions to motors of varying type and varying power. Thus 5-horsepower-hours might mean a 5-horsepower motor run for one hour, a 1-horsepower motor run for five hours, etc.

11. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 283: 2686-2692.

than gasoline. Because many "high-rate" utilities have disregarded that fact, "internal combustion" pumping is prevalent in many of the humid region's most irrigatable sections. Because REA cooperatives and other "low-rate" companies can heed that same fact, they have the opportunity of developing an excellent load simply by doing their consumers a great favor. Perhaps a table prepared by C. E. Robey shows better than anything else the relation between charges for gallons of gasoline and kilowatt-hours of electricity:

Pumping Costs For Acre-Inch Of Water^{1/}

Head in feet	Gas Engine (Price Per Gallon)				Electric Motor (Price Per kwh)			
	10¢	12¢	14¢	16¢	1¢	2¢	3¢	5¢
20	\$0.09	\$0.10	\$0.12	\$0.14	\$0.04	\$0.09	\$0.14	\$0.23
30	.13	.15	.19	.21	.06	.12	.17	.29
40	.19	.22	.25	.30	.09	.18	.27	.45
50	.23	.26	.30	.34	.11	.23	.34	.57
60	.27	.32	.36	.42	.14	.27	.40	.63
70	.31	.38	.43	.50	.16	.32	.48	.79
80	.35	.42	.48	.56	.18	.36	.54	.91
90	.39	.48	.54	.63	.21	.41	.61	1.02
100	.45	.54	.63	.71	.23	.45	.68	1.13
125	.54	.65	.76	.88	.28	.57	.85	1.42
150	.66	.79	.93	1.08	.34	.68	1.02	1.69
175	.77	.92	1.09	1.24	.40	.80	1.20	2.00
200	.88	1.08	1.22	1.42	.45	.90	1.35	2.26

^{1/} Table is based on consumption of an averaged-sized plot -- as illustrated in detail on page 32 -- operating under normal conditions. Pumping costs may be considerably different on a plot smaller or larger than the average range; the same holds true for an installation with a power unit too large for the pump, equipment out of adjustment, or an unsuitable pump.

4. MAINTENANCE COSTS represent a minor factor in analyzing the relative desirability of gas engines and electric motors in supplemental irrigation. Neither is likely to break down completely and both cost little to fix. Gas engines are somewhat less durable but most farmers can do their own repair work and thus avoid the occasional cash outlays that come when electrical apparatus needs doctoring. All things considered, this factor neither lessens or heightens the preferred rating given electric motors because of their lower operating costs and widespread extra-irrigation uses.

B. ELECTRICITY IN USE

If low-rate electricity is deemed to have certain advantages over gasoline as power for supplemental crop watering, the logical next interests of both the prospective irrigator and RIA are what size motor will be required and how much current will be consumed. Those interests can only be satisfied by considering determining factors as the size and location of the plot to be irrigated, the frequency and rapidity with which water will probably be applied, and the particular method of water distribution (permanent overhead, porous hose, etc.) demanded by the terrain, climate and crop. Though the variability and complex inter-relations of the above factors tend to give different answers on every installation, a normal irrigation unit in an RIA project area is likely to have approximately a 3-horsepower motor and a 500 kwh per-season

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

consumption. Perhaps estimates for any specific undertaking will be suggested by the following discussion of how plot location, irrigation frequency, etc. -- as expressed in terms of necessary gallons per minute, total feet of head, etc. -- do decide motor horsepower and kwh consumption.

1. MOTOR HORSEPOWER should vary directly with gallons per minute and feet of head. A one-acre garden not more than 100 yards from the water supply, to illustrate, might be powered very satisfactorily with one horsepower. For a six-acre plot about 400 yards from water, however, an irrigator would probably want five horsepower -- considered by some as the limit safely carried on RLA single-phase construction. To understand what motor to get for what installation, therefore, it is necessary to analyze how plot size and other matters underlie gallons per minute (GPM) needs and how distance-from-water and other matters determine total feet of head. In going through this analysis a reader might well bear in mind, for the sake of knowing the general GPM and head range of supplemental irrigation, that the typical installation requires a flow of about 75 gallons per minute and a head of about 90 feet.

a. Gallons Per Minute. Distribution method and time allotment for irrigation are the variables, besides plot size, which determine necessary pumping speed. In the first place, overhead spray, revolving sprinkler and other irrigation systems which are economical

... ..

... .. suggested by the following discussion of new, old location,
... .. frequency, etc. -- as expressed in terms of necessary
... .. gallons per minute, total feet of head, etc. -- to decide water
... .. horsepower and kW consumption.

1.

... .. and feet of head. A one-acre garden not more than 100 feet from
... .. the water supply, to illustrate, might be covered very satisfactorily
... .. with one horsepower. For a six-acre plot about 400 yards from water,
... .. however, an irrigator would possibly want five horsepower -- con-
... .. sidered by some as the limit easily carried on RMA single-phase
... .. construction. To understand what water to get for what installation,
... .. therefore, it is necessary to analyze now plot size and other matters
... .. unmetiric gallons per minute (GPM) needs and how distance-from-water
... .. and other matters determine total feet of head. In going through
... .. such analysis a reader might well bear in mind, for the sake of
... .. knowing the general GPM and head range of supplemental irrigation,
... .. that the typical installation requires a flow of about 75 gallons

... ..

... ..

... .. ment for irrigation are the variables, besides plot size, which de-
... .. termine necessary pumping speed. In the first place, overhead spray,
... ..

with water naturally require less gallons per minute to do a given job in a given time than do systems, like furrow and flood, which are characterized by considerable waste. Secondly, it is evident that an irrigator who wants to cover an acre with an inch of water in three hours will have to pump faster than one who is content to do the same thing in six hours. Finally, it is also plain that irrigation of a five-acre plot in a given number of hours will require more rapid pumping than would the watering of a two-acre plot in identical time.

As primary determinant of GPM for the individual grower with limited irrigation area, the time allotment for supplemental watering seems to deserve additional explanation. In making their decision on this factor, most successful irrigators plan to give their plot one complete inch-depth application about every ten days. Many of them with large installations do not do this, however, through a system which finishes the entire job in a few hours. Instead they have motors and pumps with only enough capacity to give complete areal coverage on a section-per-day-rotation basis. According to a C.R.E.A. Bulletin, this "piecemeal" system brings the farmer several economies: low installation cost, non-idle equipment, lower-priced energy, etc. For a REA cooperative or other utility supplying the power, the system also has advantages: it means a steady load; it means more installations can be powered by motors used safely with single-phase construction.

Considering time allotment and the two other factors as determinants, it is possible to estimate the gallons-per-minute that may need pumping on various sized plots which REA project members would be likely to irrigate. Some probable GPM requirements for fields of representative acreages are indicated in the following list, together with the time arrangement of actual watering within each ten-day irrigation cycle: one-half acre, one-seven hour application -- 35 GPM; three acres, three seven-hour applications -- 70 GPM; seven acres, four six-hour applications -- 140 GPM; ten acres, five six-hour applications -- 165 GPM. As explained in the next few pages, those gallon-per-minute requirements may be translated into probable horsepower and potential load -- a typical head of 70 feet is assumed for the translation here -- to give a list of figures which should interest REA: half-acre with 35 GPM -- 1-horsepower motor and 81 kwh per season; three-acres with 70 GPM -- 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ -horsepower and 420 kwh; seven acres with 140 GPM -- 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ -horsepower and 850 kwh; ten-acres with 165 GPM -- 5-horsepower and 1,190 kwh. The estimates are not extended upwards beyond ten acres, incidentally, because ordinary REA construction could not safely serve the facilities which are required for larger installations.

b. Feet of Head. As noted in introducing this section, the amount of gravity and friction resistance to pumping is the

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...
...the ... of the ...

other factor -- besides gallons per minute -- which determines the necessary capacity of irrigation motors. This resistance, or "head" as it is technically termed, is based on four variables: vertical distance from water level to pump, vertical distance from pump to highest point in field, friction loss in pipe line conveying water from source to distribution system, pressure required for optimum operation of the particular distribution system. The greater the sum to which these variables add -- and in this is their significance to the prospective irrigator and to RRA -- the larger the motor that will be needed and the more numerous the kilowatt-hours that will be consumed.

The first two influences, vertical distances from water to pump and from pump to field, need little explanation. Every foot that water for irrigation must be elevated means, in the language of hydrodynamics, another head-foot of resistance to pumping. Because of that one-to-one relationship, "vertical-distance" characteristics of plot location and terrain have perhaps more weight than any other one influence in determining whether horsepower capacity and kwh consumption for a given plot will be relatively small or large.

Pipe-line friction, the third variable influencing total head, depends on the relationship between three factors. Firstly, gallon-per-minute flow -- determined by the considerations explained

in the last subsection effects pipe-resistance directly, an increase in GPM rate causing an increased friction loss and vice versa. Secondly, pipe length -- decided by an irrigation plot's distance from the water supply -- also has a direct effect upon conveyor-line resistance, a long pipe involving more friction loss than a short. Finally, an inverse influence diameter meaning less resistance and vice versa. Because this last factor is completely a matter of an irrigator's own decision, the pipe line resistance variable can be controlled to keep total head at the most desirable minimum, as indicated in the following estimated diameters for several plots likely to be typical of REA installations: one-half acre, three hundred feet from water -- $1\frac{1}{2}$ " pipe to carry 35 GPM with 35 foot friction loss; three acres, five hundred feet from water -- 2" pipe to carry 70 GPM with 55 foot friction loss; seven acres, seven hundred feet from water -- 3" pipe to carry 140 GPM with 40 foot friction loss; ten acres, twelve hundred feet from water -- $3\frac{1}{2}$ " pipe to carry 165 GPM with 44 foot friction loss.

Besides pipe-line resistance and vertical lift as determinants of total head, there is -- as mentioned previously -- the operating pressure required for the particular distribution system. This pressure varies from an equivalent of fifty head-feet for

[illegible]

sprinkler irrigation, through twenty-five head-feet for porous hose and fifteen for perforated pipe, to nothing at all for the surface methods. The selection of a system -- and consequent "distribution" head -- depends on what method is best adapted to the terrain, crop, plot size, etc.

Through proper consideration of the four variables described, it is possible to make estimates of likely head and -- directly significant for REA -- of resulting likely motor horsepower and current usage. Thus, a one-half acre, "three-hundred-feet-from-water" plot with the revolving sprinkler system and an "above-water" elevation of twenty-five feet might have 110 head-feet resistance to pumping. Translated into motor requirements and probable load (of course a reasonable GPM flow has to be assumed to do this here and later) such a head might mean a motor of 2-horsepower and an annual consumption of 125 kwh. The following list summarizes similar estimates for several other representative installations: three acres, five hundred feet from water, forty feet above water, porous hose -- 120 feet, 4-horsepower, 740 kwh; seven acres, seven hundred feet from water, fifteen feet above water, perforated pipe -- 85 feet, 4½ horsepower, 955 kwh; ten acres, twelve hundred feet from water, twenty feet above water, furrow -- 67 feet, 5-horsepower, 1,050 kwh.

c. Correlating GPM and Head. Having analyzed separately the two factors that determine horsepower of motors likely to be used on RIA lines, it now remains to show the inter-relationships between the two influences. A table prepared by O. E. Robey reveals these inter-workings better than could a ream of words and indicates just how great a burden the cooperative lines might have to carry under a variety of irrigation conditions. In studying this table two things might well be kept in mind: (1) any situation calling for more than five horsepower should be eliminated from consideration as possible load on RIA single-phase construction; (2) because motor capacity is directly related to pump size, it is assumed here and in earlier estimates that the pump as well as the motor is to be correctly adapted -- as explained in a later chapter -- to the peculiar conditions of any particular installation.

Horsepower For Pumping At 50 Per Cent Pump Efficiency

Gallons per minute	Total Head in Feet									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	75	100	125	150
10	.05	.10	.15	.20	.25	.30	.37	.50	.62	.75
15	.08	.15	.22	.30	.37	.44	.56	.75	.94	1.12
20	.10	.20	.30	.40	.50	.60	.75	1.00	1.25	1.50
25	.13	.25	.37	.50	.62	.74	.94	1.25	1.56	1.87
30	.15	.30	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.12	1.50	1.87	2.25
35	.18	.35	.52	.70	.87	1.04	1.31	1.75	2.19	2.62
40	.20	.40	.60	.80	1.00	1.20	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00
45	.23	.45	.67	.90	1.12	1.34	1.69	2.25	2.81	3.37
50	.25	.50	.75	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.87	2.50	3.12	3.75
60	.30	.60	.90	1.20	1.50	1.80	2.25	3.00	3.75	4.50
75	.38	.75	1.12	1.50	1.87	2.24	2.81	3.75	4.69	5.62
90	.45	.90	1.35	1.80	2.25	2.70	3.37	4.50	5.62	6.75
100	.50	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.75	5.00	6.25	7.50
125	.63	1.25	1.87	2.50	3.12	3.74	4.69	6.25	7.81	9.37
150	.75	1.50	2.25	3.00	3.75	4.50	5.62	7.50	9.37	11.25
175	.88	1.75	2.62	3.50	4.37	5.24	6.56	8.75	10.94	13.12
200	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.50	10.00	12.50	15.00
250	1.25	2.50	3.75	5.00	6.25	7.50	9.37	12.50	15.72	18.75

2. KWH CONSUMPTION on supplemental irrigation installations is another subject, like required motor capacities, which holds considerable significance for both the humid-region grower and REA. The average plot of somewhat less than three acres, for example, will use approximately the following: 20 kwh per acre-inch, 55 kwh for each complete application -- likely to be accomplished at least once every ten days, 186 kwh per acre per season, 497 kwh for the entire plot per acre per season. Without knowing roughly how much electricity will be used in watering plots of various sizes and locations, the prospective irrigator cannot estimate the financial

feasibility of his tentative undertaking and RHA's Utilization Division cannot estimate the probable increase in cooperative load from a campaign to "sell" Eastern irrigation.

Dealt with in the following paragraphs, consequently, are the various factors determining the amount of current used in irrigating humid-area crops. Leaving till later a discussion of increases in project loads, the ensuing material will emphasize the individual aspect of irrigation consumption. Among the featured topics will be the deciding influence of head, equipment and other factors upon kilowatt-hours per acre-inch and of plot size, climatic conditions and other things upon total usage per season.

a. Consumption Per-Acre Inch. Kwh needed for pumping a given amount of water -- let us say the 27,154 gallons comprising an acre-inch -- is somewhat different for every installation. Such variation springs from the plot-to-plot differences in basic determinants of power consumption. These determinants -- as with motor requirements -- are the acreage, location, terrain and soil of the irrigated land. Working through two immediately deciding factors -- feet of head against which irrigation must be accomplished and efficiency of equipment with which irrigation must be accomplished -- the physical characteristics mentioned settle whether per acre-inch pumping costs for any particular installation are prohibitive, moderate, or very low.

- 25 -

Feet of head -- depending on a field's vertical and horizontal distances from water and on the distribution system required by terrain, etc. -- influence pumping consumption more than any other factor. The greater the adverse head, the harder a motor must work to deliver a given amount of water and the more current it consumes, an average relationship being one kilowatt-hour for each 4.5 feet of head against which an acre-inch must be lifted. Because of that direct head-kwh connection, operation of level, near-to-water plots would involve less cooperative load but more individual profit than rolling, far-from-water installations.

Equipment efficiency, variations in which cause the lifting power of a kilowatt-hour to deviate from the 4.5 feet-per-kwh average, is the other influence upon the per acre-inch power consumption of supplemental irrigation. Among the secondary determinants of this efficiency are several matters over which the grower himself can exercise considerable control: the coordination of pump and motor, the plant's state of repair, the excellence of lubrication, etc. Disastrous as slip-ups in those matters can be, however, probably the major determinants are -- as for head-feet -- the physical characteristics of irrigation installations. Because plots with different characteristics demand irrigating plants of different delivery and pressure capacities -- and hence different efficiencies -- two separate irrigators with identical mechanical and cultivational

[illegible]

skill will be very unlikely to get the same amount of pumping power per kilowatt-hour of current used. This relationship between plant capacity as expressed in the horsepower of the motor used, and plant efficiency is illustrated by the following table:^{1/}

Efficiencies Of Different Motors
(Amount of adverse head overcome by one kw in pumping one acre-inch of water)

Horsepower of motor	Amount of head (Feet)	Plant Efficiency (Per Cent)
1	4	42
2	4.3	45
3	4.6	48
4	4.8	50
5	5	52

b. Total Consumption Per Season. Though kwh consumption per acre-inch is the common technical basis for measuring current usage for crop-water pumping, the prospective irrigator or the utility manager -- be he cooperative or private -- is probably more interested at the beginning in how much "juice" a complete installation is likely to take during the full irrigation season. For the average plot during a normal summer that total consumption -- as already has been said -- is likely to be about 500 kwh; but for some particular installation during some particular year, the

^{1/} In the table it is assumed that motors and pumps are perfectly adapted to one another and in perfect running condition.

figures may be anything from 10 to 1,200. Plot size, rainfall conditions, and type of crop are among the more important factors determining how many acre-inch applications must be made and, hence, how much the total consumption figures will be.

Most of the factors influencing seasonal usage are so obvious as to need little explanation. It is self-evident, for example, that water requirements -- hence current consumption -- are directly related to plot size, that a careful irrigator will waste less water -- hence less kilowatt-hours -- than one who "doesn't give a damn", that some distribution systems of the surface variety require more water -- hence more "juice" -- than do economical systems like the overhead sprinkler. It is almost as plain that more current will be used in watering crops which demand much water than those which require little, in irrigating terrains with high run-off than those which have slow drainage, in satisfying soils without good substratum than those which have an impervious layer underneath.

The factor with greatest weight is, of course, the amount of rain that falls and its distribution. In a normal humid-region summer about nine complete applications per season are needed, one every ten days. During a drought year, however, this number may be doubled and during a "bumper-crop" year, halved. Experience best teaches the irrigator in a particular locale how moist to keep his ground and, consequently, how often to turn on the

[illegible]

Kilowatt-Hours Used In Supplemental Irrigation

Head	Analysis of con- sumption	Size of Plot (Acres)								Averages (2.8)
		.25	.5	.75	.1	2.5	.4	.6	8.5	
20	T.P.S.	11.7	22.5	33.3	44.1	103.5	154.8	21.6	275.4	107.7
	P.A.P.S.	46	45.8	45.	44.1	41.4	38.7	36	32.4	40.5
	E.C.A.	1.3	2.5	3.7	4.9	11.5	17.2	24	30.6	12
	P.A.I.	5.1	5.1	5.1	4.9	4.6	4.3	4	3.6	4.5
30	T.P.S.	15.3	30.6	45	58.5	136.8	205.2	286.2	367.2	143.1
	P.A.P.S.	61.2	61.2	60.3	58.5	54.9	51.3	47.7	43.2	54.
	E.C.A.	1.7	3.4	5	6.5	15.2	22.8	31.8	40.8	15.9
	P.A.I.	6.8	6.8	6.7	6.5	6.1	5.7	5.3	4.8	6
40	T.P.S.	25.2	45.9	67.5	88.2	207.	309.6	432.	550.8	21.6
	P.A.P.S.	92.7	91.8	90	88.2	82.8	77.4	72	64.8	81
	E.C.A.	2.8	5.1	7.5	9.8	23	34.4	48	61.2	24
	P.A.I.	10.3	10.2	10	9.8	9.2	8.6	8	7.2	9
50	T.P.S.	29.7	58.5	86.4	112.5	262.8	396	550.8	695.7	274.5
	P.A.P.S.	117.9	117.	115.2	112.5	105.3	99	91.8	82.8	103.5
	E.C.A.	3.3	6.5	9.6	12.5	29.2	44	61.2	77.3	30.5
	P.A.I.	13.1	13	12.8	12.5	11.7	11	10.2	9.2	11.5
60	T.P.S.	35.1	68.4	100.8	132.3	310.5	464.4	648	826.2	323.1
	P.A.P.S.	138.6	137.7	135	132.3	124.2	116.1	108	97.2	121.5
	E.C.A.	3.9	7.6	11.2	14.7	34.5	51.6	72	91.8	35.9
	P.A.I.	15.4	15.3	15	14.7	13.8	12.9	12	10.8	13.5
70	T.P.S.	41.4	81	119.7	156.6	366.3	550.8	766.8	979.2	382.5
	P.A.P.S.	163.8	162.9	160.2	156.6	146.7	137.7	127.8	115.2	144
	E.C.A.	4.6	9	13.3	17.4	40.7	61.2	85.2	108.8	42.5
	P.A.I.	18.2	18.1	17.8	17.4	16.3	15.3	14.2	12.8	16
80	T.P.S.	46.8	91.8	135	176.4	414	619.2	864	1101.6	431.1
	P.A.P.S.	185.4	183.6	180	176.4	165.6	154.8	144	129.6	162
	E.C.A.	5.2	10.2	15	19.6	46	68.8	96	122.4	47.9
	P.A.I.	20.6	20.4	20.3	19.6	18.4	17.2	16	14.4	18
90	T.P.S.	53.1	104.4	153.9	200.7	469.8	705.6	982.8	1254.6	490.5
	P.A.P.S.	210.6	208.8	205.2	200.7	188.1	176.4	163.8	147.6	184.5
	E.C.A.	5.9	11.6	17.1	22.3	52.2	78.4	109.2	139.4	54.5
	P.A.I.	23.4	23.2	22.8	22.3	20.9	19.6	18.2	16.4	20.5
100	T.P.S.	58.5	114.3	168.3	220.5	517.5	774.	1080.	1377.	539.1
	P.A.P.S.	232.2	229.5	225.	220.5	207.	193.5	180.	162.	202.5
	E.C.A.	6.5	12.7	18.7	24.5	57.5	86.	120.	153.	59.9
	P.A.I.	25.8	25.5	25.	24.5	23.	21.5	20.	18.	22.5

1/ Figures given here are based on several necessary assumptions: average conditions of rainfall terrain, soil, crop, etc.; correctly chosen pump and motor; proper lubrication and good state of repair. See above discussion for the ways in which consumption is affected by circumstances different than those assumed.

Kilowatt-Hours Used In Supplemental Irrigation

Head	Analysis of con- sumption	Size of Plot (Acres)								Averages (2.8)
		.25	.5	.75	.1	2.5	.4	.6	8.5	
125	T.P.S.	73.8	144.9	213.3	279.	654.3	979.2	1366.2	1744.2	682.2
	P.A.P.S.	294.3	290.7	285.3	279.	261.9	244.8	227.7	205.2	256.5
	E.C.A.	8.2	16.1	23.7	31.	72.7	108.8	151.8	193.8	75.8
	P.A.I.	32.7	32.3	31.7	31.	29.1	27.2	25.3	22.8	28.5
150	T.P.S.	87.3	172.8	254.7	333.	780.3	111.7	1630.8	2080.8	813.6
	P.A.P.S.	350.1	346.5	340.2	333.	312.3	292.5	271.8	244.8	306.
	E.C.A.	9.7	19.2	28.3	37.	86.7	130.	181.2	231.2	90.4
	P.A.I.	38.9	38.5	37.8	37.	34.7	32.5	30.2	27.2	34.
175	T.P.S.	94.5	203.4	299.7	391.5	919.8	1375.2	1917.	2448.	955.8
	P.A.P.S.	412.2	407.7	399.6	391.5	368.1	343.8	319.5	288.	360.
	E.C.A.	10.5	22.6	33.3	43.5	102.2	152.8	213.	272.	106.2
	P.A.I.	45.8	45.3	44.4	43.5	40.9	38.2	35.5	32.	40.
200	T.P.S.	116.1	238.5	337.5	441.	1035.	1548.	2160.	2754.	1079.1
	P.A.P.S.	465.3	459.	450.	441.	414.	387.	360.	324.	405.
	E.C.A.	12.9	26.5	37.5	49.	115.	172.	240.	306.	119.9
	P.A.I.	51.7	51.	50.	49.	46.	43.	40.	36.	45.
Averages (91.5)	T.P.S.	53.1	105.3	155.7	202.5	475.2	716.4	993.6	1269.9	496.8
	P.A.P.S.	212.4	210.6	207.	202.5	189.9	179.1	165.6	149.4	186.3
	E.C.A.	5.9	11.7	17.3	22.5	52.8	79.6	110.4	141.1	55.2
	P.A.I.	23.6	23.4	23.	22.5	21.1	19.9	18.4	16.6	20.7

1. T.P.S. ---- Total consumption per season
2. P.A.P.S. -- Consumption per acre per season
3. E.C.A. ---- Consumption for each complete application
4. P.A.I. ---- Consumption per acre-inch

C. IRRIGATION AS REA LOAD

Vital as individual pumping consumption is to a prospective irrigator or a rural "high-line" company, the feasibility of a promotional campaign for arid-region crop-watering depends even more upon another "known-for-irrigation" matter, -- potential project load from combined individual consumptions. Though this varies from section to section in accordance

Table 1. Results of the experiment

No.	1954								No.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1
2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2
3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3
4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4
5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	5
6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	6
7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	7
8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	8
9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	9
10	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	10
11	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	11
12	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	12
13	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	13
14	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	14
15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	15
16	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	16
17	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	17
18	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	18
19	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	19
20	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	20
21	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	21
22	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	22
23	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	23
24	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	24
25	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	25
26	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	26
27	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	27
28	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	28
29	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	29
30	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	30

1. P.A.1. --- Control
2. P.A.2. --- Control
3. P.A.3. --- Control
4. P.A.4. --- Control

Table 2. Results of the experiment

Table 2. Results of the experiment. The table shows the results of the experiment for the different treatments. The results are given in the form of a table with 4 columns: Treatment, No. of plants, No. of fruits, and No. of seeds. The results are given for the different treatments: Control, P.A.1, P.A.2, P.A.3, and P.A.4. The results are given for the different treatments: Control, P.A.1, P.A.2, P.A.3, and P.A.4. The results are given for the different treatments: Control, P.A.1, P.A.2, P.A.3, and P.A.4.

with agricultural characteristics, almost everywhere it is stable and surprisingly heavy. By creating a market for off-peak energy and increasing member-incomes so much that more could be spent on current for other purposes, supplemental irrigation would improve the load of REA borrowers in thirty-three states. As explained hereafter, the night and summer valleys in rural power distribution might be evened out and nation-wide kilowatt-hour consumption in REA projects augmented eventually by 60,500,000 kwh per year.^{1/}

1. QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS of supplemental irrigation load -- steadiness, "off-peakness", and productivity -- are one major reason, then, for the desirability of crop-water pumping on REA lines. Because water is applied slowly and application days vary from installation to installation^{2/}, there are no costly fluctuations in consumption. Because all irrigation is done in summer and much can be done very advantageously during sleeping time^{3/}, many kilowatt-hours of otherwise wasted energy are consumed. Because watered crops are bigger and better, there is -- instead of the almost too customary "greater ease-of-living" -- a marked increase in farm income.

-
- ^{1/} Direct pumping load. No allowance is made for possible consumption increases resulting from irrigators' enlarged incomes.
- ^{2/} Differences in crops, terrain, soil, personal preference and other influences cause this variation. Rainfall is not a factor since reference is to installations in the same project area.
- ^{3/} Night irrigation is suggested by R. E. Horton. See page

2. LARGE QUANTITY, another common characteristic of crop-watering consumption, is the second major reason for the desirability of supplemental irrigation load. Besides the already-mentioned usage-per-season estimates for a typical installation (490-500 kwh) and for potential total RIA installations (60,500,000 kwh), various other approximations -- based ultimately on material of such authorities as Horton, Hobe and C.R.E.A. -- indicate the surprising possible magnitude of annual pumping load: overall per-member^{1/} average -- 79 kwh, typical 800-member project -- 79,200 kwh, potential increase in present humid-state RIA usage -- 14 per cent. Further evidence of heavy quantity consumption is given by various averages of potential irrigation load per month: per member during pumping season^{2/} -- 24 kwh, typical project during pumping season -- 16,500 kwh, per member for whole year -- 8 kwh, per project for whole year -- 6,500 kwh. Such estimates are not intended, of course, as a rosy picture of immediately obtainable load but as an indication of what several years of well-planned utilization effort might accomplish.

Though these over-all figures suggest general magnitude, more specific project or section estimates -- consumption for a particular organization or state likely being considerably different

^{1/} Not per-irrigator.

^{2/} June, July, August and September are the irrigation months in most states. Southern section is exception.

- 36 -

than the national REA averages -- require consideration of numerous load-deciding variables. Among these factors are six of the "individual-consumption" influences: rainfall, terrain, soil, crops, season length and water availability. Among them, too, are a like number of indirect considerations: markets, income, attitudes, tenancy, irrigation, experience, and familiarity with electricity. Being components of the total setting for crop watering, those influences determine three basic matters: how many members might irrigate, how much water the irrigators might apply, how much current might be used in applying the water. Perhaps the significance of the various influences -- discussed also in other parts of this study -- can best be clarified here by an analysis of potential load in several projects and sections.

a. Project Analysis^{1/}: To estimate potential irrigation consumption for any particular REA area, each determinant must be properly evaluated. Various factors would be "high-load influences", for example, when they were as follows: rainfall-scanty, soils-light, crops-leafy, seasons-long, surface water-plentiful, markets-large and nearby, incomes-high, attitudes-forward-looking, farm tenancy-low, electrical experience-considerable. "Low-load tendencies" would be exhibited

^{1/} Membership or consumption figures given in this subsection are from the March 1939 Operations report.

The first of these is the fact that the
 results of the experiments are not
 in general in agreement with the
 theoretical predictions. This is
 particularly true in the case of
 the experiments on the effect of
 the concentration of the solution
 on the rate of reaction. The
 theoretical prediction is that the
 rate of reaction should be
 proportional to the square of the
 concentration of the solution, but
 the experimental results show that
 the rate of reaction is only
 proportional to the first power of
 the concentration. This is a
 very important result, as it
 shows that the reaction is not
 a simple bimolecular reaction, but
 is a more complex reaction,
 involving more than two molecules
 of the reactants. This is a
 very important result, as it
 shows that the reaction is not
 a simple bimolecular reaction, but
 is a more complex reaction,
 involving more than two molecules
 of the reactants.

when opposite adjectives applied. Familiarity with irrigation practices might be classed as another "high-load influence", were it not for the fact that growers with gas engine installations sometimes hesitate to replace them. A mixed force is exercised by terrain conditions; with ruggedness making for few irrigators but high individual consumption, while levelness does the opposite.

(1) Let's look at Pennsylvania-17-Armstrong, a 733-member project just north of Pittsburgh to see how those numerous variables affect the potential irrigation load of a representative Eastern borrower. There are various "high-load" influences: light soils, "general-farming" crops like table vegetables and berries, plentiful ponds and streams, good markets in nearby urban areas and along numerous traversing highways, and the large percentage of farms owned by their operators. Counterbalancing those tendencies, however, are several factors: low average incomes (\$436 net cash per year), conservative attitudes, lack of irrigation experience, and slowness in adopting electricity (present consumption per member -- 45 kwh per month). A less definite one-way influence is given by the other variables: a normal humid-region rainfall and summer requiring about nine supplemental-water applications for optimum harvests, and a rugged terrain which discourages irrigation but makes individual consumption heavy. In combined force those twelve factors seem to indicate a potential

When applied to the subject of the present paper, the following considerations may be of interest to the reader. It is well known that the human mind is not a blank slate, but that it is filled with a vast amount of information which is acquired from the environment. This information is stored in the memory and is available for use when needed. The process of learning is essentially a process of acquiring new information and integrating it with the information already stored in the memory. The result of this process is a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is.

(1) The first point to be considered is the nature of the information which is acquired from the environment.

One of the most important sources of information is the senses. The eyes, ears, nose, tongue, and skin are all organs which are capable of receiving information from the environment. This information is then processed by the brain and is stored in the memory. The process of learning is essentially a process of acquiring new information and integrating it with the information already stored in the memory. The result of this process is a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The second point to be considered is the nature of the information which is stored in the memory. The memory is a storehouse of information which is available for use when needed. It is important to note that the memory is not a perfect storehouse, but that it is subject to errors and distortions. The third point to be considered is the nature of the process of learning. Learning is a process which involves the acquisition of new information and the integration of this information with the information already stored in the memory. The result of this process is a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The fourth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The fifth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The sixth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The seventh point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The eighth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The ninth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is. The tenth point to be considered is the nature of the information which is used in the process of learning. The information which is used in the process of learning is the information which is stored in the memory. This information is used to form a more complete and accurate representation of the world as it is.

yearly irrigation load of moderate dimensions^{1/}: 150 irrigators -- 20 per cent of membership, 443 kwh per irrigator, 91 kwh per member, 66,450 kwh total.

(2) Comparison with that Eastern situation is supplied by Georgia-67-Bacon, a representative Southern borrower with 984 members in southeastern Georgia. There are only three clear-cut "high-load" factors: long growing season, numerous rivers, and an average income surprisingly good for that section (\$814 net cash). Four influences, in contrast, work definitely toward a low consumption: plentiful rainfall (26" in seven growing months), conservative attitudes, large amount of tenancy (60%) and a decided lack of irrigation experience. The other factors and their affects vary as indicated here: level terrain -- large-scale installations but low consumption per-acre inch; eroded, sandy soils -- not much land fit for irrigation but high consumption on what is; cotton and tobacco specialities with some truck -- irrigation not needed for most crops; no city markets but considerable highway demand -- numerous installations for roadside produce. In the situation indicated by these variables, yearly irrigation load would probably never average more than the following: 125 irrigators -- 13 per cent of membership, 370 kwh per irrigator, 47 kwh per member, 46,250 kwh total.

^{1/} In comparing irrigation loads of different projects, the factors usually deserving most emphasis are: per cent of membership irrigating, consumption per irrigator, consumption per member. The other considerations -- number of irrigators and total load -- are influenced strongly, of course, by differences in the membership size of different borrowers.

(3) Better adapted to supplemental irrigation development than either the Pennsylvania or Georgia borrowers, are various mid-western projects -- of which Indiana-24-Carroll is perhaps representative. With 955 consumers in northwestern Indiana, this organization's potential pumping load is influenced towards largeness by nine of the twelve pertinent factors: uneven rainfall, a terrain not rough enough to discourage irrigation but rolling enough to require considerable current, light soils, "general-farming" crops (corn, vegetables, berries, pasturage) plentiful surface water, highway and city markets, large average incomes (net cash -- \$1,436), wide-awake attitudes, and a low percentage of tenancy. The only definite "low-rate influence" seems to be an apparent slowness in giving electricity widespread utilization (present monthly consumption -- 44 kwh). Seasons are of normal length and a few members have had experience with gas-engine installations which would doubtless be replaced if pumping rates were made attractive. Considering that optimistic picture, potential annual load can be estimated as follows: 233 irrigators -- 23 per cent of membership, 490 kwh per member, 119 kwh per irrigator, 114,170 kwh total.

(4) Located in a less important group of humid-region projects is Washington-25-Cowlitz, rather representative of supplemental irrigation potentialities in the "West-of-the-Cascades" area.

[illegible]

A relatively heavy load is suggested for this 179-member borrower by the following factors: scanty summer rainfall (twelve or more applications per season would probably be necessary), sandy soils, crops of high water-consumption (alfalfa, kale, cabbage, etc.), numerous streams, progressive attitudes, owner operation (tenancy — 14%), and familiarity with irrigation practices. Purely negative influence seems to be exercised only by the low average incomes (net cash — \$691) and the lack of electrical experience. The terrain is a mixture of creek-bottom flats and little hills that is neither a great encouragement or discouragement to small-scale crop-watering. Seasons are of normal length and the market — while nothing outstanding — is bolstered up by the nearness of Portland. With such influencing variables as those, potential load may approximate the following: 25 irrigators — 14 per cent of membership^{1/}, 475 kwh per irrigator, 66 kwh per member, 11,875 kwh total.

b. Sectional Analysis. As indicated by load figures for these representative projects, some states are better adapted to supplemental irrigation development than others. The consumption characteristics of any section will depend, of course, upon the combined results of utilization in individual projects, but there

1/ Small percentage of irrigators is partly result of the large number of lumbering and other non-farm members.

are certain overall tendencies which can be mentioned in painting a general picture. These tendencies are based upon the same factors as were used in analyzing project load. In brief preview, it can be said that the order of success from the viewpoint of irrigation "selling" by REA is as follows:

Mid-west, East, South and Northwest.

(1) In the Mid-west the potential load from crop-watering is high because nearly everyone of the twelve variables exercises some influence in that direction. There are frequent long periods between rainfalls, a terrain neither too flat nor too rough, light soils, and numerous sources from which water can be pumped. Among the indirect considerations are such things as progressive attitudes, generally high incomes, a large urban population, and some degree of familiarity with electricity. With these influences in mind, the following estimates of potential load do not seem unreasonable: 79,072 irrigators — 22.7 per cent of membership, 509 kwh per irrigator, 115 kwh per member, 40,296,017 kwh total.

(2) Though the East contains fewer projects than the Mid-western sector, it has many states in which REA would do well to promote supplemental irrigation. Markets are very large, numerous, and near to the projects. There is much truck growing for the large metropolitan areas and for roadside stands. Some of the soils and terrains are not too well adapted to artificial crop

watering, but these drawbacks are not serious. Potential pumping load, therefore, might be as follows: 11,443 irrigators -- 21.4 per cent of membership, 494 kwh per irrigator, 107 kwh per member, 5,657,469 kwh total.

(3) Because incomes are low, rainfall plentiful, attitudes conservative, etc., the South will not be likely to take on supplemental irrigation so widely as other sections. Because of the large number of projects, however, total load will be high and is worth going after. Also, there are such favorable influences as the long season, the numerous sections -- like Florida -- where intensive truck growing is carried on, and the plentiful water available for pumping. Potential load: 33,708 irrigators -- 16 per cent of membership, 434 kwh per irrigator, 72 kwh per member, 14,641,320 kwh total.

(4) If the humid regions of the Northwest contained more projects, this section might rank higher as a field for supplemental watering development by RIA. The growing seasons are very dry and irrigation increase yields phenomenally. Incomes are fairly high, there is considerable experience with gas engine installations, and attitudes are very forward looking. Total potential yearly load is only 11,875 kwh and -- because many members are not farmers -- the consumption per member is only 66 kwh, but the other figures are more revealing: 465 kwh per irrigator for the 625 cooperators likely to install systems.

Total 3,867,469

1. Figures are based on allotment figures, as of 1934. The full potential load would be considerably higher if all allotments of that date were reached.

[illegible]

(1) It is not possible to have a single, uniform, and
 comprehensive system of law, which would be
 applicable to all cases, and which would be
 binding on all courts, and which would be
 subject to the control of a single authority.
 (2) It is not possible to have a single, uniform, and
 comprehensive system of law, which would be
 applicable to all cases, and which would be
 binding on all courts, and which would be
 subject to the control of a single authority.

c. Analyses Tabulated. In order that REA might have ideas of potential load for particular states, estimates have been made for the thirty-three states in which supplemental irrigation would be feasible. These are based, primarily, on materials of C.A.S.A., Robey, Staebner and Horton:

Potential Supplemental Irrigation Load
Per Season For REA Borrowers^{1/}

Section	Total kwh con- sumption	Likely num- ber of irrigators	Average kwh per irrigator	Average kwh per member	Likely load of typical project (80 members)
1. The East:	5,657,469	11,443	494	107	84,800
Conn.....	24,750	55	450	108	86,400
Del.....	675,400	1,227	550	206	164,800
Maine...	47,850	87	550	124	99,200
Md.(w)...	105,420	251	420	79	63,200
a. N.J.....	210,450	366	575	142	113,600
N. Y.(x)	431,775	909	475	71	56,800
Pa.....	2,050,730	3,982	515	116	92,800
Vt.....	39,150	87	450	84	67,200
Va.....	1,985,624	4,252	467	94	75,200
W.Va....	86,260	227	380	57	44,800
b. Pa.-17- Armstrong (y)	66,450	150	443	91	—
2. The South:	14,641,320	33,708	434	72	57,600
Ala.....	1,050,000	2,500	420	57	45,600
Ark.....	828,000	2,300	360	46	36,800
Fla.....	735,930	1,258	585	145	116,000
Ga.....	3,808,400	9,775	390	73	58,400
a. La.....	575,920	1,694	340	51	40,800
Miss....	1,301,810	3,886	335	50	40,000
N.C.....	1,879,200	4,176	450	84	67,200
S.C.....	824,190	1,986	415	68	54,400
Tenn....	3,617,830	7,133	510	97	77,600

^{1/} Estimates are based on allotment figures, as of June 1, 1939. Thus, the full potential load suggested probably could not be realized until all allotments of that date have reached energization.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., dated December 10, 1968.

Potential Supplemental Irrigation Load

Per Season For FMA Borrowers

Section	Total kwh con- sumption	Likely num- ber of irrigators	Average kwh per irrigator	Average kwh per member	Likely load of typical project (800 members)
b. Ga.-67-					
Bacon(y)	46,250	125	370	47	---
3. The Mid-					
west...	40,265,017	79,072	509	115	92,000
Tll.....	5,633,600	11,200	503	151	120,800
Ind.....	7,042,000	14,000	503	137	100,600
Io.....	5,638,200	9,330	540	142	113,600
Ky.....	1,161,065	3,181	365	40	52,800
Mich.....	4,238,300	7,706	550	124	99,200
Minn.....	3,891,300	7,630	510	105	84,000
a. Mo.....	2,274,030	4,594	495	74	59,200
Neb.(z)..	1,206,150	2,365	510	63	50,400
N.D.(z)..	369,396	993	372	177	141,600
Ohio.....	5,556,000	10,485	528	131	104,800
S.D.(z)..	169,680	336	505	146	116,800
Isc.....	3,487,456	6,672	523	118	94,400
b. Ind.-24-					
Carroll(y)	114,170	233	490	119	---
4. The North-					
west....	290,625	625	465	60	48,000
a. Oregon(z)	107,820	232	465	64	51,200
Wash.(z).	182,745	393	465	57	45,600
b. Wash.-25-					
Cowlitz(y)	11,875	25	475	66	---
5. The Whole					
country.	60,642,066	123,636	491	79	79,200

(w) If projects were in "truck" regions, potential irrigation load would be much higher.

(x) No "cooperative" projects. Irrigation load available to N.Y.Ces and Electric Corporation, the only borrowers.

(y) See discussion above.

(z) Includes only projects in humid portions of these states.

IV. OPTIMUM CONDITIONS

Despite the many potential benefits from supplemental irrigation, however, it is only advisable -- as was hinted in the last chapter -- when certain conditions, besides rainfall inadequacy, are in evidence. The water supply should be sufficient to completely cover the irrigated acreage about every ten days. The soil and terrain should be well adapted to supplemental water. Moreover, the crops grown should be varieties which have proven successful under irrigation.

Since the presence or absence of these conditions varies from farm to farm, the decision as to advisability must be made on an individual basis. If the decision is made correctly, the increased income from supplemental irrigation in almost every season should more than cover charges for labor, operation and overhead. It should be noted, however, that this practice will not succeed even in the most ideal situation, unless the irrigator uses his installation wisely and complements it with generally sound cultivational and business techniques.

A. PROPER WATER SUPPLY AVAILABLE

The first essential of advisable supplemental irrigation is a plentiful, reliable and conveniently located water supply.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FUTURE

It is, however, it is only a matter of time -- as we pointed out in the
last chapter -- before the world will be a very different place.
The soil and terrain should be well adapted to agricultural water.
However, the crops grown should be selected which have proven
themselves to be profitable.

There are many factors to be considered in the selection of crops.
First, the soil must be suitable for the crop. If the soil is not
suitable, the crop will not grow. Second, the climate must be
suitable for the crop. If the climate is not suitable, the crop
will not grow. Third, the market must be suitable for the crop.
If the market is not suitable, the crop will not be profitable.
Fourth, the labor must be suitable for the crop. If the labor is
not suitable, the crop will not be profitable. Fifth, the capital
must be suitable for the crop. If the capital is not suitable,
the crop will not be profitable. Sixth, the government must be
suitable for the crop. If the government is not suitable, the
crop will not be profitable.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FUTURE

The problem of the future is a very complex one. It involves
many factors, and it is not possible to give a simple answer.
However, it is clear that the world will be a very different place
in the future, and it is our duty to prepare for that future.

Satisfactory supplemental irrigation requires a surprisingly heavy amount of water. The average irrigated plot should be blanketed with an inch-depth of water about every ten days during the hot part of the growing season. This seems that there must be at least 27,000 gallons of water (an acre-inch) available for each acre at each irrigation or -- figuring nine irrigations per summer -- about 243,000 gallons per acre per season. Most irrigation experts, however, say that these figures should be doubled, because of losses in conveyance and distribution, to 54,000 gallons per irrigation and 486,000 gallons per season.

Reliability of water supply is an important consideration. The heaviest demands of a supplemental irrigation installation must be fulfilled during the driest part of the summer. Stream and well records should be carefully surveyed for height of flow in dry spells before any irrigation investment is made. This survey is especially necessary in Eastern Nebraska, South Dakota and other states along the Western edge of the humid zone.

Location plays a part in determining a water supply's suitability for supplemental irrigation. Piping and pumping, necessary elements in conveying water from the lake, river, or other source to irrigation plot -- are expensive features, whose expense varies directly with the distance and elevation to be covered. Generally speaking, a conveyor line of over 1,500 feet is financially unfeasible

... of water supply in the immediate neighborhood
of the proposed site of a proposed irrigation installation
and all records should be carefully preserved for reference
in any case before any irrigation installation is made. This
and other states along the western edge of the United States
should place a part in data ...
... irrigation installation. Pipelines and reservoirs, necessary
... in carrying water from the lake, river, or other sources
... distance and elevation to be covered. ...

unless gravity can be utilized.

Even the quality of water available has some bearing on the success of supplemental irrigation. Swamps, bogs, and too heavily concentrated sewage are not good sources. Water from warm, particle-filled streams, however, is exceptionally beneficial because it has some degree of fertilizing, as well as irrigating, value.

There are various water sources which can satisfy the requirements mentioned above. In general these can be classified under the following heads: flowing streams, wells, still-water, other sources.

The flowing streams are very satisfactory if they have sufficient volume and do not go dry in mid-summer. They provide an inexpensive source which does not involve a high vertical lift and sometimes even makes possible gravity conveyance. Springs, small creeks, and large rivers are included in the category.

Supplemental irrigation water can be provided by wells of varying capacities, providing the depth does not necessitate too great expenditure for a high-head pump and high-power motor. Large-capacity wells need be pumped only as applications to the land are necessary. Medium-capacity wells have to be pumped 24 hours a day during the irrigation season, with water being stored in intervals

between actual irrigations. Small-capacity wells can be used if they are pumped continuously during the spring and summer, with storage being accomplished in small individual farm ponds.

These small individual farm ponds, of course, are also a still-water source of irrigation water. Rough but satisfactory dams, according to drainage engineer F. B. Stuebner can be constructed in a week's time, using tractors and the regular farm help. Such dams are usually placed in gulleys and narrow ravines where they can store either spring run-off or the flow of small brooks. Incidentally ponds of this nature represent a contribution to soil conservation as well as supplemental irrigation. The other still-water resources are lakes and an occasional water pit made by excavation below the water table.

Miscellaneous water supplies used for supplemental irrigation include city-water mains and city sewerage. REA irrigators, moreover, might very well be able to integrate their irrigation system with their already-installed house and barn plumbing systems.

B. PROPER SOIL AND TERRAIN

The second condition necessary before humid-area irrigation is advisable, is a soil and terrain well adapted to supplemental water. Such is the case, according to a News Letter of the Illinois State Horticultural Society, when the water-holding capacity is neither very high nor very low, the land is not hilly but does provide drainage, the substratum is relatively impervious and about sixteen inches below the surface.

... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...
... of the ... zone, ... capacity ...

... where they are ...
... of ...
... to ...
... by excavation below the water table.

...
...
...
...
...

CONCLUSIONS

... is a ...
... water. ...
...
...
...
... below the surface.

Sandy loams give excellent results under irrigation as do most of the lighter soils. Fine-textured clays and loams sometimes cake when supplemental water is applied.

Hilly land is undesirable from the farmer's viewpoint since it makes impossible certain inexpensive methods of irrigation as well as making more expensive those which can be used. The rough terrain develops a high head and consequently necessitates bigger pumps, bigger motors, and more energy. A slow even slope, incidentally, is considered desirable.

The impervious substratum is more essential to some methods than others, but means better results no matter what technique is used. If there is no such stratum, the water sinks below the root range before the plants have had a full opportunity to absorb it.

C. PROPER PLANTS GROWN

Supplemental irrigation is advisable only when applied to certain crops, which are grown intensively and are particularly susceptible to moisture conditions. Truck crops — especially spinach, radishes, tomatoes, beets — are in this category, as are various small fruits, like strawberries, logan-berries, etc. Citrus and orchard fruits also respond well to irrigation. Potatoes and beans are cash crops giving particularly large returns under proper supplemental water.

Irrigation has also been successfully applied in humid areas to pasture and field crops — particularly corn and alfalfa. The investment and acreage involved are so large, however, that these crops are rarely chosen by a grower for his first venture into supplemental watering. This is especially true in the East where the decentralized nature of rural holdings makes thousand dollar cultivational expenditures a decided rarity.

D. INCOME EXCEEDS EXPENDITURE

Most important of all factors in determining the advisability of supplemental irrigation for any particular grower, is the likelihood of the investments "paying out". Increased yields which cost more than they bring in are no boon to the farmer except as the net outgo is payment for crop insurance.

The likelihood of paying out depends on a complex of various factors. The expense of irrigation — determined to some extent by the particular irrigational method which can be employed — is an important consideration. The nearness and steadiness of the demand is another, as is the price level for the crop irrigated. The wisdom with which the irrigator applies his water and markets his larger and better crops also helps decide success or failure. Later on we will cite some statistics

* "The [illegible] statement was not so in

V. IRRIGATION METHODS

When a farmer is determining the advisability of supplemental irrigation for his particular crop, one of the important considerations should be the means by which that irrigation might be accomplished. Various situations call for various distributional methods having various advantages and various installation and operation costs. Where one system would be feasible, another might not. In this section, therefore, we will discuss briefly the distinguishing characteristics of each method.

A. OVER-ALL IRRIGATION CHARACTERISTICS

Such a discussion should be preceded, however, by mention of certain features which are common to all irrigation systems. These features have to do with the transferal of the water from its source to the point of distribution among the plants. As such they involve pumps, motors, conveyor pipe, etc.

1. THE TYPE OF PUMP essential to satisfactory irrigation depends on the amount of head which has to be overcome. Generally speaking, centrifugal pumps are preferable because of more regular flow, greater reliability, and more reasonable first cost. Where there are high heads to be overcome the deep well turbine should be used. The amount of head depends on the following factors: suction, vertical lift, friction loss (varying with

length and diameter of pipe), and necessary operating pressure (varying with the distribution method). Within a pump type, as explained in Chapter III, the size depends upon the area to be irrigated, the rapidity with which irrigation is desired, the distribution method used. In other words the necessary gallon per minute capacity is the measure to determine the pump size. The table below was prepared by Robey to show necessary capacities under varying conditions:

Size of Pump Required for Applying One Inch of Irrigation
Water on Various Areas

Size of Area in Acres	Rate of Application — Hours									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Gallons per minute									
0.1.....	50	25	16.6	12.5	10	8.7	7.1	6.2	5.5	5
0.2.....	100	50	33.3	25	20	16.6	14.2	12.5	11	10
0.3.....	150	75	50	37.5	30	25	21.4	18.7	16.6	15
0.4.....	200	100	66.6	50	40	33.3	28.5	25	22	20
0.5.....	250	125	83.3	62.5	50	41.6	35.7	31	27.7	25
0.6.....	300	150	100	75	60	50	42.8	37.5	33.3	30
0.7.....	350	175	116.6	87.5	70	58.3	50	43.7	38.8	35
0.8.....	400	200	133.3	100	80	66.6	57	50	44.4	40
0.9.....	450	225	150	112.5	90	75	64	56	50	45
1.....	500	250	166	125	100	83	71	62	55	50
2.....	1,000	500	333	250	200	166	142	125	110	100
3.....	1,500	750	500	375	300	250	214	187	166	150
4.....	2,000	1,000	666	500	400	333	285	250	220	200
5.....	2,500	1,250	833	625	500	416	357	310	277	250
6.....	3,000	1,500	1,000	750	600	500	428	375	333	300
7.....	3,500	1,750	1,166	875	700	583	500	437	388	350
8.....	4,000	2,000	1,333	1,000	800	666	570	500	444	400
9.....	4,500	2,250	1,500	1,125	900	750	640	560	500	450

1. State of Tennessee
 2. County of Davidson

[illegible]

2. THE MOTIVE POWER for irrigation pumping may be furnished by either a gasoline or electric motor. The horsepower required depends on the necessary gallons per minute and the head which has to be overcome. In other words, the selection of a satisfactory motor involves consideration of the same factors as does selection of a satisfactory pump. Indeed, a correctly-chosen pump will not give the desired results unless it is complemented by a correctly-chosen motor.

2. PIPING FROM WATER SOURCE to distribution plot is an expensive element in irrigation installation. Metal pipe is recommended but occasionally heavy canvas hose can be used. Because of friction loss, the size of pipe influences the amount of head and therefore the choice of pump and motor. The general rule is that pipe diameter should vary directly with the distance to be piped and the gallons per minute necessary for satisfactory irrigation. Thus a two inch pipe is recommended for conveying 40 gallons per minute 600 feet, 3 inch pipe 100 gallons per minute 1,000 feet. An attempt to economize by buying too small pipe is counteracted by the necessity of using more energy.

B. SUBSURFACE IRRIGATION

Distributing water after it gets to the crop area -- and it is in the distribution, as explained before, that supplemental irrigation techniques vary -- may be done by the subsurface method.

Porous tiles are laid approximately 18 inches below the top soil and water gradually percolates up from them to the root structure. The method is much used in Florida for citrus growing, but otherwise it is quite uncommon.

Subirrigation is only successful where several special conditions exist. The top soil has to be underlain — as is the case in Florida — by an impervious substratum which will prevent the water from going down instead of up. Moreover, a sandy soil is almost an essential, as is a level or slowly sloping terrain. Besides these limitations, the method is also quite expensive and hence can only be applied to high-priced, intensive crops.

C. SPRAY IRRIGATION

Probably the best and most expensive methods of distributing supplemental water come under the general heading of spray irrigation. The distinguishing characteristic of these methods is that they use pressure to send jets of water upon the plants to be irrigated. They have the common advantage of adaptability to almost any terrain and any soil.

1. OVERHEAD SPRINKLER PIPE IRRIGATION, as developed by the Skinner Company of Troy, Ohio, is probably the best known method of Eastern irrigation. It has been used successfully by truck gardeners for thirty years, and is probably not excelled by

any other method for very high-priced intensive crops grown on small acreage. The installation cost is very high but the operation cost is exceedingly low.

According to claims put forward by the Skinner Company, this system satisfied all the principles of sound irrigation. By slow, spray-like distribution at the rate of an acre-inch in seven hours, it leaves the ground "unpuddled" and uncaked. The unhurried and unexcessive application also enables the soil to absorb the water without becoming "cold". Because the irrigation comes as a gentle mist, plants are not bruised or chilled. Considerable frost protection is possible with this system, as is excellent uniformity of distribution. With it a grower has complete control over the amount and time of irrigation. Such claims as these are not over-estimation, but it should be noted that other methods also have certain of these capabilities.

The system, as described by J. P. Schoenzer in "Agricultural Engineering" consists of elevated pipe lines supported as posts $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 feet in height, and about fifty feet apart. The pipe is drilled and topped for a fine-bore brass nozzle every 3 or 4 feet. When water is pumped into it at 40-pounds or more pressure, tiny streams of water come from the nozzles which are perpendicular to the pipe and parallel to each other. The pipe can be turned so as to irrigate first one side of it and then the other. Approximately

870 feet of pipe are required to water an acre.

Some growers use portable equipment. This reduces the installation cost, but increases the labor required in moving the nozzle lines from field to field. The pipe may be laid upon the ground, low posts, or special devices. It does have the advantage of being out of the way for field work. Because of the constant moving, portable installations will not have the length of life of equipment installed permanently.

2. REVOLVING SPRINKLER IRRIGATION is another very satisfactory method of spray irrigation. If a portable system is selected — as is now possible with the development of flexible joint pipes — the installation costs are lower than for the overhead system and the operating costs not much higher. It, too, can be used on rolling topography and for frost protection, though not quite so effectively as the Skinner method. Like the Skinner, also, its slow application gives adequate irrigation without erosion and caking. The system seems particularly well adapted for small kitchen-garden units.

The layout now usually consists of a semi-permanent main feeder line with portable, light-weight laterals. These laterals are moved from place to place as the water is applied to the land. The pipe used for the laterals is of light weight and comes in 20 foot lengths.

Double-nozzle sprinkler heads have been developed. One of these covers the outer area of the circle while the other irrigates the inner section. "A discharge of 15 to 20 gallons per minute and covering a diameter of 90 feet at 40 pounds pressure, is common practice," says Schoenzer. One revolution or less per minute is a desirable speed for the sprinkler.

3. PERFORATED PIPE IRRIGATION is a new development in the spray irrigation category. Its chief advantage is the low operating pressure necessary; this ranges from 2 to 6 pounds. The method is best adapted to row crops. It cannot be used for frost protection and probably is somewhat less uniform in application than the other spray systems. The installation lasts long and is moderately priced.

The method consists of 4- or 5-inch flexible joint pipe with small staggered perforations along its length. The pipe moved from row to row as the irrigation progresses, the labor involved not being extremely tedious. "Eyalet hose" is a canvas version of this method.

D. SURFACE IRRIGATION

So-called "surface" methods of applying supplemental water are characterized by direct distribution to the top-soil without benefit of any devices converting the water into a down-pouring of fine spray. The water is applied in a sheet or in a series of sheets.

The first of these is the fact that the water is not only clean but also free from any harmful bacteria. This is due to the fact that the water is taken from a deep well and is not exposed to the air. The second is the fact that the water is not only clean but also free from any harmful bacteria. This is due to the fact that the water is taken from a deep well and is not exposed to the air.

The third is the fact that the water is not only clean but also free from any harmful bacteria. This is due to the fact that the water is taken from a deep well and is not exposed to the air. The fourth is the fact that the water is not only clean but also free from any harmful bacteria. This is due to the fact that the water is taken from a deep well and is not exposed to the air.

The method can be of 4- or 5-inch flexible, joint pipe with... The method can be of 4- or 5-inch flexible, joint pipe with... The method can be of 4- or 5-inch flexible, joint pipe with...

...so-called "curb" or "curb" and it is applied to the water... associated by direct distribution to the top-soil without benefit... the water into a down-sloping of fine

spray. Included in this category are some of the most primitive and least expensive systems of irrigation. Most of the methods are associated with large-scale Western watering but they can sometimes be applied to Eastern irrigation as well. All of them require, however, that the irrigated area be smooth and either level or slightly sloping.

There are various drawbacks to these methods. The necessary leveling may prove costly, in addition to exposing unproductive sub-soil. There is a tendency towards puddling, caking and uneven distribution. The systems are very uneconomical with water; the land is usually over-watered, much evaporation loss occurs, there may be considerable leakage, etc. Despite these disadvantages, however, the method is a decided benefit to various "mass-production" crops not intensively enough cultivated to justify the more expensive techniques.

1. THE FURROW METHOD is used a great deal in connection with the production of row crops. Field furrow between the crop rows carry the water which is supplied by the conveyor system from head ditches, or gated, low-pressure, light weight, portable surface pipe or other similar means. To secure the most uniform results, the slope of each furrow should be such and the quantity of water entering it such an amount as to reach the lower end as quickly as possible. The slope should not be so steep, however, as to cause erosion.

... the ... of the ...
... the ... of the ...
... the ... of the ...
... the ... of the ...
... the ... of the ...

There are various devices to these ...
... level ... in addition to ...
... There is a tendency ...
... The ... are very ...
... the ... is usually ...

... the ... is a ...
... the ... is not ...
... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...

... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...
... the ... is ...

2. THE FLOODING AND CHECK METHODS of irrigation consist of permitting water taken from a distribution ditch or feeder pipe to flow over the land. Naturally, the level of the water in the ditch must be higher than the land and must be located at the highest point in the field. The area is divided into checks and basins which are opened to a certain amount of water and then closed. Careful leveling and considerable labor are necessary.

3. THE BORDER METHOD of irrigation involves layout parallel strips of land extending down the slope of the area. Each strip is demarcated by borders between which the irrigation water flows. Widths of 25 feet and lengths of not above 300 feet are recommended for sandy loams. The water is regulated as for the furrow and flooding systems.

E. POROUS HOSE IRRIGATION

The distinguishing feature of another method of irrigation — developed chiefly in Michigan — is the use of canvas to convey and distribute water. One end of the hose is attached to the water supply line while the other end is closed. As the water is pumped into the hose and fills it, the 15-to-20 pound internal pressure causes it to ooze slowly through the walls. Various devices are used in moving the hose from row to row. The method is very well adapted to kitchen gardens.

It is noted that the water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea. This is due to the fact that the river is a tidal river and the water level is affected by the tide. The water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide. The water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide.

3. THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION. The method of investigation is a simple one. It is based on the fact that the water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide. The water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide.

It is noted that the water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea. This is due to the fact that the river is a tidal river and the water level is affected by the tide. The water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide. The water level in the river is higher than the level of the sea during the flood tide and lower during the ebb tide.

The system has several important advantages which lead R. L. Horton to predict its widespread acceptance in the East. The slow application means no erosion and also hinders puddling and caking. The direct-to-soil application keeps leaves dry and thus takes impossible the harm which sprinkling is supposed to do some plants. It is a system, moreover, which can be used over rough ground having elevations up to three feet. The installation cost is very low and the method is extremely flexible.

There are several disadvantages which partially counteract the benefits mentioned in the last paragraph. Much labor is involved in moving the hose and considerable care must be taken to see that no tender plants are harmed in this process. The depreciation charges are quite high since the canvas has a usual maximum life of three years. The rate of application is almost too slow for large installations.

VI. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Amidst the multitude of cost and income statements which humid-area irrigators have compiled, the one fact which stands out clearly is that ninety per cent of the installations have paid out in a remarkably short time. Almost always supplemental irrigation has been something more than a mere negative insurance. Beyond that central point, however, there is much conflicting and disorganized testimony as to detail.

The absence of a clear, complete, consistent presentation of supplemental irrigation's financial aspects is chiefly due to the great variability in those aspects. Every method has a different installation cost and operating charge. Some farmers already have part of their equipment; others do not. The size of the area to be irrigated has considerable influence upon the per-acre installation cost. The dryness of the season decides the frequency of necessary irrigation and hence, influences the operating charges.

It is possible, however, to make rough estimates of the likely cost of irrigating a given area with various methods under fairly typical conditions. In this section, therefore,

THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF IRRIGATION

...the maintenance of cost and income statements
...which have been compiled, the one fact
...is that nearly all the
...have been paid out in a remarkably short time.
...Almost always supplemental irrigation has been something
...than a mere negative measure. Beyond that control
...however, there is much conflicting and disorganized
...testimony as to details.

...of supplemental irrigation's financial aspects is chiefly
...due to the great variability in these aspects. They depend
...on a number of factors, such as the amount of water
...available, the cost of water, the cost of labor, the
...The value of the area to be irrigated has considerable influence
...upon the per-acre irrigation cost. The dryness of the season
...decides the frequency of necessary irrigation and hence, in-

It is possible, however, to make rough estimates of the

we will set forth the approximate expenditures involved in irrigating a three-acre plot 750 feet from the water supply; such an installation might be considered a typical size for humid-area irrigators using supplemental water on income-producing crops. The per-acre figures arrived at — based as they are on rough averages of data supplied by Robey, Stoesbner, various Oregon investigators, a C.R.S.A. report, and several other experimenters — may be considered quite representative for installations of an acre and up. Kitchen gardens and other small areas call for different approximations.

In evaluating these estimates, the reader should keep several points in mind. Labor charges have been included at the rate of \$.30 per hour; it is often the case, however, that a considerable amount of work connected with irrigation can be done by the irrigator himself in time which might otherwise be used less productively. Probable costs for everything from well-digging to conveyor pipe have been included but it is very likely that a farmer considering irrigation would already possess some of the necessary equipment. Moreover, it is also probable that such equipment — even if it is bought primarily for irrigation — can be used for other farm purposes, thus giving good ground for charging part of expenditure and depreciation against some other use.

... will be found that the ...
...-score plot 100 feet from the river supply;
... installation might be considered a typical size for
... investigation using experimental water on ...
... The 20000 ft. ... arrived at -- based
... and several other experiments -- say we considered ...
... representative for installation of an ... and ...
... and other small sizes of ... for different applications.
...
... several points in mind. Labor charges were ... of the
... of \$1.50 per hour; it is often the case, however, that a
... done by the trigger himself in this which alone ...
... be much less productively. Probable costs for everything from
...-digging to concrete pipe have been included but it is very
... that such equipment -- even if it is bought primarily for ...
... can be used for other ... purposes, thus giving good
... part of expenditure and ... than expected

A. INSTALLATION COSTS

A three-acre plot 750 feet from the stream requires a system of water conveyance — pump, motor, main pipe-line, etc. — and a method of distribution. As discussed before, the conveyance system — at least on a plot of that size — will be approximately the same regardless of what distribution is called for by peculiarities of terrain, soil and crop raised. Therefore, we will give estimates for "conveyance" cost first and follow them with data concerning various distribution techniques. Note the following table:

1. Cost of Getting Water to Distribution Point

Items	Cost, 3-acre	Cost per acre	Remarks
1. <u>Small Dam</u> (Including labor, tractor, fuel, engineering advise, etc.).....	\$ 50.00	\$ 16.66	Usually not necessary. May have soil conservation worth and provide water for cattle. Part of expense might well be charged against those uses.
2. <u>Well</u> (Digging moderately deep well or series of shallow ones).....	\$125.00	\$ 41.66	Last resort when no other supply available. Generally too expensive for Eastern irrigation.
3. <u>Pump</u> (Usually centrifugal).....	\$ 75.00	\$ 25.00	Piston pumps sometimes used on smaller installations.
4. <u>Motor</u> (3 hp. gas or electric).....	\$ 75.00	\$ 25.00	One half of expense might well be charged against other uses.
5. <u>Conveyor Pipe</u> (3" metal at 18¢ per foot).....	\$135.00	\$ 45.00	Many units have to carry water less than 750 feet.
6. <u>Miscellaneous Fixtures</u> (elbows, screens, etc.)....	\$ 18.00	\$ 6.00	Sometimes farm odds-and-ends can be used for 1/3 of expenditure.

method of distribution. As discussed before, the conveyance system --
 of least on a plot of that size -- will be more likely the same
 regardless of what distribution is called for by necessity of
 terrain, soil and crop raised. Therefore, we will give estimates
 for "conveyance" cost first and follow this with data concerning

	Cost per acre	Cost per acre	Notes
Part of conveyance will be for and provide water for cattle have a 100% conveyance worth	1.00	1.00	1.00 (100% conveyance)
Least cost when no other conveyance is required	0.50	0.50	0.50 (50% conveyance)
on a 100% conveyance	0.50	0.50	0.50 (50% conveyance)
The half of conveyance cost will be charged against	0.50	0.50	0.50 (50% conveyance)
and water have to work	0.50	0.50	0.50 (50% conveyance)
can be used for 1/3 of ex-	0.50	0.50	0.50 (50% conveyance)

- 65 -

1. Cost of Getting Water to Distribution Point

Items	Cost, 3-acre	Cost per acre	Remarks
7. Installation Labor (@30¢ per hour).....	\$ 6.00	\$ 2.00	Farmers do much of this themselves and do not count it regular expendi- ture
<hr/>			
<u>TOTALS -- CONVEYANCE INSTALLATION</u>			
1. <u>Maximum, Water Supply Available</u>	\$309.00	\$103.00	Quite common. Expenditure advisable on good irri- gation crops
2. <u>Maximum, Dam Built</u>	\$359.00	\$119.67	Feasible when high priced crops grown or dam has marked soil conservation value
3. <u>Maximum, Well Pkg</u>	\$434.00	\$144.67	Rarely feasible except on large installations and high priced cash crop
4. Probable Minimum (Free water, motor already possessed, labor not counted, 1/3 off on miscellaneous fix- tures).....	\$222.00	\$ 74.00	Feasible for pasture irri- gation, alfalfa, corn and other low-priced crops
5. Most Likely (Free water, 1/2 labor counted, 1/3 off on miscellaneous fixtures).....	\$262.50	\$ 87.50	Advisable for irrigation of all good irrigation crops, including alfalfa

Several clarifying remarks might be made before we pass on to the other element of installation costs: 1. Because acreage changes do not cause proportionate changes in equipment expenditures, the cost per acre tends to decrease as the installation becomes larger and to

not one thing to decrease as the installation becomes larger and to

- 66 -

increase as it becomes smaller. 2. Totals for "conveyance"

installation costs under different combinations than presented,

and easily be worked out from the above table 3. The approxi-

mations are more likely to be over than under-estimates.

2. Distribution System Costs and Total Installation Expenditures

Method	Cost of distribution equipment per acre	Labor used installing distribution equipment, per acre	Total distribution installation cost per acre	Most likely total installation cost, per acre	Remarks
1. Sub-irrigation.....	\$140.00	\$ 10.00	\$150.00	\$337.50	Labor cost high in burying tiles. Cannot be done by irrigator himself. For correct soil condition and high-priced, readily-cold crop
2. Furrows.....	\$ 5.00	\$ 7.10	\$ 7.10	\$ 93.55	Little equipment but wooden sluices and gates. Little labor needed. Hardy plants and gradual slope. At least 1/2 labor can be done by farmer himself
3. Border.....	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 3.50	\$ 91.00	Hardly any equipment needed. Considerable labor necessary to make borders but at least 1/2 can be done by farmer himself. Gradual slope, hardy plants

- 67 -

2. Distribution System Costs and Total Installation Expenditures

Method	Cost of distribution equipment per acre	Labor used installing distribution equipment, per acre	Total distribution in installation cost per acre	Most likely total installation cost, per acre	Remarks
4. Flood and check.....	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.30	\$ 5.30	\$ 91.65	Hardly any equipment needed. Some labor used in outlining check plots but at least 1/2 can be done by irrigator himself. Gradual slope, etc.
5. Permanent overhead.....	\$295.00	\$ 3.50	\$298.50	\$384.25	Considerable labor involved in setting poles, raising line, etc. Adapted to most soil and terrain, but must have intensive crop. About 1/2 labor done by farmer
6. Portable overhead.....	\$168.00	\$ 2.00	\$170.00	\$256.50	Less labor involved because permanent line setting is not a part of job. At least half labor could be done by farmer himself. More operating labor needed
7. Revolving sprinklers.....	\$ 73.00	\$ 1.80	\$ 74.80	\$101.40	Not much labor involved in laying main feeder line if surface variety used. Other labor is of operating nature. At least 1/2 labor and be done by farmer himself.

2. Distribution System Costs and Total Installation Expenditures

Method	Cost of distribution equipment per acre	Labor used installing distribution equipment, per acre	Total distribution installation cost per acre	Most likely total installation cost, per acre	Remarks
8. Perforated pipe..	\$ 50.00	\$.30	\$ 50.50	\$117.50	Practically all labor is of operating nature. That labor there is connected with installation can be done entirely by farmer
9. Porous hose.....	\$ 5.00	\$.50	\$ 5.50	\$ 92.50	Practically all labor is of operating nature. Installation can all be done by farmer

The worth of that table, too, may be enhanced by several explanatory remarks: 1. In reckoning "most likely total installation cost per acre", the labor cost has been included as one-half the total used, i.e., only the actual payout for labor is considered as an element of total installation expenditure; there are exceptions for sub-irrigation where all labor is added — because the large amount of it necessitates much hired help— and for perforated pipe and porous where no labor is added — because the small amount of it can be entirely accomplished by the farmer himself. 2. The size of the

Approved for Release by NSA on 08-05-2013 pursuant to E.O. 13526

- 69 -

installation costs indicates that certain types of supplemental irrigation for "larger-than-an-acre" plots can only be available to the average farmer if some reasonable financing method is provided. 3. The size of installation costs indicates, also, that irrigation for the farm budget is a major business transaction; to succeed — in most cases — it must be applied to high-priced "truck", berries or certain lower-priced products, like potatoes, that are phenomenally benefited by supplemental water. 4. The "most likely" conveyance installation cost has been used as the basis for estimating "most likely total installation" expenditures with different systems; costs under different "conveyance-installation" conditions can be worked out by referring to the prior table. 5. Once again the error is more likely to be on the side of over-estimation.

That our "average-and-judgment" estimates are probably not very far wrong is indicated by comparison with several of the most respected studies in the field. For instance, the average installation cost of 2021.75 acres of permanent overhead irrigation in New Jersey was \$377.31 per acre (our estimate — \$384.25) according to New Jersey Bulletin #453. In Farmer's Bulletin #1635, F. E. Stoeber suggests that a surface system using sewer pipe "conveyance" is apt to cost about \$100 per acre (our estimate — \$92 surface systems average). Portable revolving sprinkler irrigation, according to another Stoeber publication, might involve expenditure of about

- 70 -

\$150 per acre on "above-five-acre" installations (our estimate — \$161.40). A C.E.E.A. Bulletin tells of a Florida citrus grower and truck farmer who paid \$350 per acre for a sub-irrigation system (our estimate — \$161.40). A C.E.E.A. Bulletin tells of a Florida citrus grower and truck farmer who paid \$350 per acre for a sub-irrigation system (our estimate — \$337.50).

B. OPERATION CHARGES

After an irrigator has past the initial hurdle of installation costs, the outgo per season is what interests him. Once again there are certain elements of the charge which vary from system to system and others which do not. Since expenditure for "conveyance" equipment is approximately the same no matter what distributional technique is used, the depreciation and maintenance charges for that part of a complete installation are likewise the same no matter what the distributional system. Charges for energy, operating labor, interest, distribution system depreciation and maintenance, on the other hand depend directly upon the particular method applied.

The charts that follow present estimates of probable average operating charges for the various systems on plots larger than an acre. The "most likely 'conveyance' installation costs" and the "most likely" total installation costs have been used as a basis for reckoning depreciation and interest charges in these approximations;

- 71 -

the results obtained should be considered the "most likely operating charges." Depreciation on "conveyance" installation has been reckoned at 10 per cent and maintenance on "conveyance" installation is estimated at \$1.80 per acre per year. Interest is figured at 6 per cent; labor at \$.30 per hour, energy at .02 per kwh. The acre-inch approximations are worked out on the basis of 9 inch water application per acre per year, an average suggested by both Robey and Horton.

In all cases "total 1" represents the real operating expenses and should be given the most weight in determining whether the annual income from supplemental irrigation justified the annual expenses for it. Totals 2, 3, and 4 represent several "operating cost" concepts which many farmers have. They are based on what is actually paid out in money under various conditions. Few farmers, to illustrate the idea, actually keep a depreciation reserve; few farmers, who have done their own irrigation financing, think of 6 per cent of their net return (interest) as an operating charge; most farmers do not mentally designate part of the irrigation return as wages for their own irrigation work. To them, all returns above payout for energy, maintenance, and hired-help may be "profits".

- 72 -

1. Operating Charges, Sub-Irrigation

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 72	\$.08	Very little labor needed to operate. Necessary amount decreases as acreage increases
2. Interest.....	\$ 20.25	\$ 2.25	Reckoned on \$337.50
3. Distribution System Depreciation.....	\$ 37.50	\$ 4.17	Reckoned on \$250 at 15%. Tile deteriorates
4. Distribution System Maintenance.....	\$ 3.00	\$.33	Tile tends to deteriorate because of buried dampness
5. "Conveyance" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	Reckoned on \$87.50
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 5.13	\$.57	Considerable head because of length of pipe and necessity of pressure
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$ 77.15	\$ 8.17	
2. Without Depreciation..	\$ 30.90	\$ 3.43	
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 10.65	\$ 1.18	Too expensive for all but highest-priced crops and best soil. Note the small- ness, however, of the active charges
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 labor.....	\$ 10.24	\$ 1.14	

2. Operating Charges, Furrev Irrigation

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	To prevent over-irrigation, puddling, etc. some provision is needed. Furrows have to be made
2. Interest.....	\$ 5.61	\$.62	Reckoned on \$93.55
3. Distribution System Depreciation.....	\$ 1.07	\$.12	Reckoned on \$7.10 @ 15%. Field distribution system of open ditches, sluice ways, etc. deteriorates gradually
4. Distribution System Maintenance.....	\$.45	\$.15	Nearly all maintenance included in labor
5. "Conveyance" Depreciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Maintenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 3.24	\$.36	No distribution pipes or pressure to cause high head
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$22.72	\$ 2.52	
2. Without Depreciation..	\$12.90	\$ 1.43	
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 7.29	\$.81	Where terrain suited, makes irrigation of lower-priced crops feasible
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 6.19	\$.69	

1. Estimated Annual Income

Item	Estimated Annual Income	Estimated Annual Income	Estimated Annual Income
1. Interest on bonds	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
2. Dividend income	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
3. Rental income	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
4. Income from other sources	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
5. Total estimated annual income	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00
6. Less: Estimated annual expenses	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00
7. Net estimated annual income	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
8. Less: Estimated annual taxes	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50
9. Net estimated annual income after taxes	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50
10. Less: Estimated annual maintenance	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.25
11. Net estimated annual income after all expenses	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.25
12. Less: Estimated annual depreciation	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10
13. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and depreciation	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.15
14. Less: Estimated annual interest on bonds	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10
15. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and interest	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05
16. Less: Estimated annual taxes on net income	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02
17. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and taxes	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.03
18. Less: Estimated annual maintenance on net income	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01
19. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and taxes and maintenance	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02
20. Less: Estimated annual depreciation on net income	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01
21. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and taxes and depreciation	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01
22. Less: Estimated annual interest on net income	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01
23. Net estimated annual income after all expenses and taxes and depreciation and interest	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

3. Operating Charge, Border Irrigation

Items	Per acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 1.20	\$.13	Not much necessary but supervision
2. Interest.....	\$ 5.31	\$.61	Reckoned on \$91.80
3. Distribution System Depreciation.....	\$.28	\$.03	Reckoned on \$5.60 @ 5%. Borders last long time
4. Distribution System Maintenance.....	\$.09	\$.01	Nearly all included in labor
5. "Conveyance" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 3.24	\$.36	Regards this, same condi- tion as furrow
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$20.87	\$ 2.32	
2. Without Depreciation...	\$11.84	\$ 1.32	
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 6.33	\$.70	
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 5.73	\$.64	Least expensive of all irri- gational methods. O.K. for orchards and handy plants when topography is correct

TABLE 1. Summary of the results of the tests.

Test No.	Test Date	Test Time	Test Result
1	10/10/50	10:00	100%
2	10/10/50	10:00	100%
3	10/10/50	10:00	100%
4	10/10/50	10:00	100%
5	10/10/50	10:00	100%
6	10/10/50	10:00	100%
7	10/10/50	10:00	100%
8	10/10/50	10:00	100%
9	10/10/50	10:00	100%
10	10/10/50	10:00	100%
11	10/10/50	10:00	100%
12	10/10/50	10:00	100%
13	10/10/50	10:00	100%
14	10/10/50	10:00	100%
15	10/10/50	10:00	100%
16	10/10/50	10:00	100%
17	10/10/50	10:00	100%
18	10/10/50	10:00	100%
19	10/10/50	10:00	100%
20	10/10/50	10:00	100%
21	10/10/50	10:00	100%
22	10/10/50	10:00	100%
23	10/10/50	10:00	100%
24	10/10/50	10:00	100%
25	10/10/50	10:00	100%
26	10/10/50	10:00	100%
27	10/10/50	10:00	100%
28	10/10/50	10:00	100%
29	10/10/50	10:00	100%
30	10/10/50	10:00	100%
31	10/10/50	10:00	100%
32	10/10/50	10:00	100%
33	10/10/50	10:00	100%
34	10/10/50	10:00	100%
35	10/10/50	10:00	100%
36	10/10/50	10:00	100%
37	10/10/50	10:00	100%
38	10/10/50	10:00	100%
39	10/10/50	10:00	100%
40	10/10/50	10:00	100%
41	10/10/50	10:00	100%
42	10/10/50	10:00	100%
43	10/10/50	10:00	100%
44	10/10/50	10:00	100%
45	10/10/50	10:00	100%
46	10/10/50	10:00	100%
47	10/10/50	10:00	100%
48	10/10/50	10:00	100%
49	10/10/50	10:00	100%
50	10/10/50	10:00	100%
51	10/10/50	10:00	100%
52	10/10/50	10:00	100%
53	10/10/50	10:00	100%
54	10/10/50	10:00	100%
55	10/10/50	10:00	100%
56	10/10/50	10:00	100%
57	10/10/50	10:00	100%
58	10/10/50	10:00	100%
59	10/10/50	10:00	100%
60	10/10/50	10:00	100%
61	10/10/50	10:00	100%
62	10/10/50	10:00	100%
63	10/10/50	10:00	100%
64	10/10/50	10:00	100%
65	10/10/50	10:00	100%
66	10/10/50	10:00	100%
67	10/10/50	10:00	100%
68	10/10/50	10:00	100%
69	10/10/50	10:00	100%
70	10/10/50	10:00	100%
71	10/10/50	10:00	100%
72	10/10/50	10:00	100%
73	10/10/50	10:00	100%
74	10/10/50	10:00	100%
75	10/10/50	10:00	100%
76	10/10/50	10:00	100%
77	10/10/50	10:00	100%
78	10/10/50	10:00	100%
79	10/10/50	10:00	100%
80	10/10/50	10:00	100%
81	10/10/50	10:00	100%
82	10/10/50	10:00	100%
83	10/10/50	10:00	100%
84	10/10/50	10:00	100%
85	10/10/50	10:00	100%
86	10/10/50	10:00	100%
87	10/10/50	10:00	100%
88	10/10/50	10:00	100%
89	10/10/50	10:00	100%
90	10/10/50	10:00	100%
91	10/10/50	10:00	100%
92	10/10/50	10:00	100%
93	10/10/50	10:00	100%
94	10/10/50	10:00	100%
95	10/10/50	10:00	100%
96	10/10/50	10:00	100%
97	10/10/50	10:00	100%
98	10/10/50	10:00	100%
99	10/10/50	10:00	100%
100	10/10/50	10:00	100%

- 75 -

4. Operating Charge, Flood Irrigation

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 1.50	\$.17	Considerable work incidental to opening and shutting check plots, etc.
2. Interest.....	\$ 5.50	\$.61	Reckoned on \$91.65
3. Distribution System Depreciation.....	\$.53	\$.06	Reckoned on \$5.90 @ 10%. Check ridges, ditches, troughs, etc. wear away
4. Distribution System Maintenance.....	\$.18	\$.02	Much included in labor
5. "Conveyance" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.90	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 3.24	\$.36	No surface system has high head
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$21.50	\$ 2.39	
2. Without Depreciation..	\$12.22	\$ 1.36	
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 6.72	\$.77	Used extensively in cran- berry, rice and orchard culture. Not much good for small-scale supple- mental irrigation
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 5.97	\$.66	

STATIONARY ENGINE LOG

Station	Rev. No.	Rev. No.	Notes
1. Station 1	12	12	Station 1
2. Station 2	12	12	Station 2
3. Station 3	12	12	Station 3
4. Station 4	12	12	Station 4
5. Station 5	12	12	Station 5
6. Station 6	12	12	Station 6
7. Station 7	12	12	Station 7
8. Station 8	12	12	Station 8
9. Station 9	12	12	Station 9
10. Station 10	12	12	Station 10
11. Station 11	12	12	Station 11
12. Station 12	12	12	Station 12
13. Station 13	12	12	Station 13
14. Station 14	12	12	Station 14
15. Station 15	12	12	Station 15
16. Station 16	12	12	Station 16
17. Station 17	12	12	Station 17
18. Station 18	12	12	Station 18
19. Station 19	12	12	Station 19
20. Station 20	12	12	Station 20
21. Station 21	12	12	Station 21
22. Station 22	12	12	Station 22
23. Station 23	12	12	Station 23
24. Station 24	12	12	Station 24
25. Station 25	12	12	Station 25
26. Station 26	12	12	Station 26
27. Station 27	12	12	Station 27
28. Station 28	12	12	Station 28
29. Station 29	12	12	Station 29
30. Station 30	12	12	Station 30
31. Station 31	12	12	Station 31
32. Station 32	12	12	Station 32
33. Station 33	12	12	Station 33
34. Station 34	12	12	Station 34
35. Station 35	12	12	Station 35
36. Station 36	12	12	Station 36
37. Station 37	12	12	Station 37
38. Station 38	12	12	Station 38
39. Station 39	12	12	Station 39
40. Station 40	12	12	Station 40
41. Station 41	12	12	Station 41
42. Station 42	12	12	Station 42
43. Station 43	12	12	Station 43
44. Station 44	12	12	Station 44
45. Station 45	12	12	Station 45
46. Station 46	12	12	Station 46
47. Station 47	12	12	Station 47
48. Station 48	12	12	Station 48
49. Station 49	12	12	Station 49
50. Station 50	12	12	Station 50
51. Station 51	12	12	Station 51
52. Station 52	12	12	Station 52
53. Station 53	12	12	Station 53
54. Station 54	12	12	Station 54
55. Station 55	12	12	Station 55
56. Station 56	12	12	Station 56
57. Station 57	12	12	Station 57
58. Station 58	12	12	Station 58
59. Station 59	12	12	Station 59
60. Station 60	12	12	Station 60
61. Station 61	12	12	Station 61
62. Station 62	12	12	Station 62
63. Station 63	12	12	Station 63
64. Station 64	12	12	Station 64
65. Station 65	12	12	Station 65
66. Station 66	12	12	Station 66
67. Station 67	12	12	Station 67
68. Station 68	12	12	Station 68
69. Station 69	12	12	Station 69
70. Station 70	12	12	Station 70
71. Station 71	12	12	Station 71
72. Station 72	12	12	Station 72
73. Station 73	12	12	Station 73
74. Station 74	12	12	Station 74
75. Station 75	12	12	Station 75
76. Station 76	12	12	Station 76
77. Station 77	12	12	Station 77
78. Station 78	12	12	Station 78
79. Station 79	12	12	Station 79
80. Station 80	12	12	Station 80
81. Station 81	12	12	Station 81
82. Station 82	12	12	Station 82
83. Station 83	12	12	Station 83
84. Station 84	12	12	Station 84
85. Station 85	12	12	Station 85
86. Station 86	12	12	Station 86
87. Station 87	12	12	Station 87
88. Station 88	12	12	Station 88
89. Station 89	12	12	Station 89
90. Station 90	12	12	Station 90
91. Station 91	12	12	Station 91
92. Station 92	12	12	Station 92
93. Station 93	12	12	Station 93
94. Station 94	12	12	Station 94
95. Station 95	12	12	Station 95
96. Station 96	12	12	Station 96
97. Station 97	12	12	Station 97
98. Station 98	12	12	Station 98
99. Station 99	12	12	Station 99
100. Station 100	12	12	Station 100

- 76 -

5. Operating Charges, Permanent Overhead Irrigation

Items	Per Acre per year	Per Acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 1.08	\$.12	Very little necessary especially when automatic oscillators used
2. Interest.....	\$ 23.05	\$ 2.56	Reckoned on \$384.25
3. "Distribution" Depreciation.....	\$ 14.93	\$ 1.66	Reckoned on \$298.50 @ 5%. Very durable equipment
4. "Distribution" Maintenance.....	\$ 1.75	\$.12	Comparatively few repairs necessary
5. "Conveyance" Depreciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Maintenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 5.13	\$.57	40 lbs. pressure in pipe
<u>TOTAL</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$ 56.49	\$ 6.28	
2. Without Depreciation...	\$ 32.81	\$ 3.65	Requires high-priced crop for feasibility. Much used in "truck" gardening. Note how powerfully operating charge is influence by high installation fee
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 9.76	\$ 1.08	
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 9.22	\$ 1.02	

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Item	Per cent of total	Per cent of total	Per cent of total
1. Wheat	10.0	10.0	10.0
2. Corn	20.0	20.0	20.0
3. Soybeans	15.0	15.0	15.0
4. Cotton	5.0	5.0	5.0
5. Rice	3.0	3.0	3.0
6. Tobacco	2.0	2.0	2.0
7. Sugar	1.0	1.0	1.0
8. Fruits	1.0	1.0	1.0
9. Vegetables	1.0	1.0	1.0
10. Livestock	1.0	1.0	1.0
11. Poultry	1.0	1.0	1.0
12. Fish	1.0	1.0	1.0
13. Other	1.0	1.0	1.0
14. Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

6. Operating Charges, Portable Overhead Irrigation

Items	Per acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 4.50	\$.50	Much necessary in moving lines
2. Interest.....	\$ 15.39	\$ 1.71	Keckoned on \$256.50
3. "Distribution" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 13.60	\$ 1.51	Keckoned on \$170. @ 8%. Continual moving makes less durable
4. "Distribution" Main- tenance.....	\$ 2.00	\$.22	Less durability means more repairs
5. "Conveyance" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 5.13	\$.57	Same pressure need as overhead
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$ 51.17	\$ 5.69	Financial wisdom of taking this in place permanent seems doubtful except where economy of first cost is an advantage; for instance, as drought insurance
2. Without depreciation...	\$ 28.82	\$ 3.20	
3. With depreciation and interest.....	\$ 13.43	\$ 1.49	
4. Without depreciation, interest and 1/2 labor.....	\$ 11.18	\$ 1.24	

Year	Month	Day	Time	Location	Remarks
1941	1	1	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	2	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	3	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	4	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	5	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	6	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	7	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	8	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	9	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	10	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	11	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	12	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	13	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	14	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	15	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	16	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	17	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	18	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	19	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	20	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	21	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	22	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	23	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	24	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	25	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	26	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	27	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	28	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	29	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	30	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco
1941	1	31	10:00	San Francisco	Left for San Francisco

- 78 -

7. Operating Charges, Portable Revolving Sprinkler Irrigation

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 3.78	\$.42	Considerable work to moving laterals
2. Interest.....	\$ 9.68	\$ 1.08	Reckoned on \$161.40
3. "Distribution Depreciation".....	\$ 7.48	\$.83	Reckoned on \$74.80 @ 10%. Quite durable, considering movability
4. "Distribution" Maintenance.....	\$ 1.75	\$.19	Moderate amount of repairs
5. "Conveyance" Depreciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Maintenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 5.13	\$.57	40 lbs. pressure wanted here also
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$ 38.37	\$ 4.26	
2. Without Depreciation.....	\$ 22.14	\$ 2.46	More reasonable than "overhead system" and almost as well adapted to hilly terrain and non-sandy soil. Feasible expenditure for most irrigation crops
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 12.46	\$ 1.38	
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 10.57	\$ 1.07	

7. Detailed Statement of Assets and Liabilities

Assets	Per 1934	Per 1935	Per 1936
1. Cash and cash equivalents	10.00	15.00	20.00
2. Government securities	100.00	120.00	140.00
3. Corporate securities	50.00	60.00	70.00
4. Real estate	200.00	220.00	240.00
5. Other assets	10.00	12.00	14.00
Total Assets	370.00	427.00	484.00
6. Accounts payable	10.00	12.00	14.00
7. Notes payable	20.00	25.00	30.00
8. Other liabilities	10.00	12.00	14.00
Total Liabilities	40.00	49.00	58.00
Net Assets	330.00	378.00	426.00

- 73 -

8. Operating Charges, Perforated Pipe

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 5.40	\$.60	Much necessary in moving pipes
2. Interest.....	\$ 8.25	\$.92	Reckoned on \$137.50
3. "Distribution" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 5.05	\$.56	Reckoned on \$50.50 @ 10%. Rusting deteriorates
4. "Distribution" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.00	\$.11	Few "parts" to wear
5. "Conveyance" Depre- ciation.....	\$ 8.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy.....	\$ 3.24	\$.36	Low-pressure delivery is feature
<u>TOTALS</u>			
1. Complete.....	\$ 33.49	\$ 3.72	
2. Without Depreciation.	\$ 19.69	\$ 2.19	
3. Without Depreciation and Interest.....	\$ 11.44	\$ 1.27	Excellent for tall-growing row-crops. Very reasonable to install and operate. No exhaust cumbersome
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 8.74	\$.97	

Account	Debit	Credit	Balance
Balance forward			100.00
Jan 1 to Jan 31	10.00		90.00
Feb 1 to Feb 28	20.00		70.00
Mar 1 to Mar 31	30.00		40.00
Apr 1 to Apr 30	40.00		0.00
May 1 to May 31	50.00		50.00
Jun 1 to Jun 30	60.00		110.00
Jul 1 to Jul 31	70.00		180.00
Aug 1 to Aug 31	80.00		260.00
Sep 1 to Sep 30	90.00		350.00
Oct 1 to Oct 31	100.00		450.00
Nov 1 to Nov 30	110.00		560.00
Dec 1 to Dec 31	120.00		680.00
Total	1000.00		680.00

- 80 -

9. Operating Charges, Porous Hose

Items	Per Acre per year	Per acre-inch	Remarks
1. Labor.....	\$ 6.30	\$.70	Hose irrigation is big job
2. Interest.....	\$ 5.55	\$.62	Reckoned on \$92.50
3. "Distribution" De- preciation.....	\$ 1.83	\$.20	Reckoned on \$5.50 @ 33 1/3%. Hose runs in three years
4. "Distribution" Main- tenance.....	\$.81	\$.09	Repairs in hose do not cost much
5. "Conveyance" De- preciation.....	\$ 2.75	\$.97	
6. "Conveyance" Main- tenance.....	\$ 1.80	\$.20	
7. Energy;.....	\$ 3.69	\$.41	Moderate pressure (20 lbs.) required
TOTALS			
1. Complete.....	\$ 28.73	\$ 3.19	
2. Without Depreciation.....	\$ 18.15	\$ 2.02	Very inexpensive and very efficient. Feasible for any irrigatable crop. Labor connected with drawback
3. Without Depreciation and interest.....	\$ 12.60	\$ 1.51	
4. Without Depreciation, Interest and 1/2 Labor.....	\$ 9.45	\$ 1.05	

[illegible]

To get the true significance of these tables, like the others, several modifying considerations should be kept in mind. First, the figures are purely estimates which in some cases -- due to lack of specific information -- are nothing more than reasoned guesses; a complete cost-analysis comparison of the various techniques -- based directly on check-plot investigations by agricultural engineers -- is a lacking essential in the field. Secondly, the estimates have purposely been set high so as not to paint an over-optimistic picture; it is possible that any actual installations -- certainly those larger or nearer-water than the three-acre, 750-foot-from-water unit upon which these approximations are based -- would cost from 1/3 to 1/4 less to operate than these figures indicate.

Another most important consideration -- hinted in the last sentence above -- arises from two inter-related facts; "conveyance" equipment, and to some extent "distribution" equipment, for larger installations need not be much more expensive than for smaller; interest and depreciation items make up a very large proportion of total operating expenses. Because of these facts, supplemental irrigation is definitely a "decreasing costs" activity with operation charges and decisions as to most reasonable system depending on size of units. On plots up to ten acres the depreciation and interest charges -- based, of course, on installation costs -- outweigh payments for labor, energy, and maintenance as detractors of total operating expense; because of that condition, initial

The first of these is the fact that the cost of production is not constant. It varies with the quantity produced. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The second of these is the fact that the cost of production is not linear. It is not a straight line. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The third of these is the fact that the cost of production is not constant. It varies with the quantity produced. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The fourth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not linear. It is not a straight line. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The fifth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not constant. It varies with the quantity produced. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The sixth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not linear. It is not a straight line. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The seventh of these is the fact that the cost of production is not constant. It varies with the quantity produced. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The eighth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not linear. It is not a straight line. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The ninth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not constant. It varies with the quantity produced. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

The tenth of these is the fact that the cost of production is not linear. It is not a straight line. This is because of the law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable factor are added to a fixed factor, the total product will increase at a decreasing rate. This means that the average cost of production will eventually rise.

expenditure for irrigation on such plots should be a primary factor in deciding what distributional system to use on units larger than ten acres, labor and energy and maintenance tend to assume greater importance in the total operating charge than do depreciation and interest; for that reason, on such large plots the systems with low active operating expenses — those which require little labor, for example — tend to become more desirable even though the initial costs may be heavy.

Despite these modifications, however, the estimates make plain at least two points. First, they show quite accurately the relative expense of the several supplemental irrigation techniques. Second, they lend emphasis to previous statements that supplemental irrigation as a business practice is generally adopted only to high-priced crops grown for a large, readily-accessible market; though the records show that the practice does pay, it does not cost an insignificant amount.

Like our installation-cost estimates, these "average-and-judgment" figures for operating charges stand up fairly well when compared with the results of several rather complete investigations. O. E. Mobey's statistics concerning a ten-acre potato patch irrigated by porous hose — correction being made for interest, depreciation, and maintenance rates used in our approximations — indicate \$2.04 per acre-inch as the operating charge.

The C.R.E.A. Bulletin estimates "a total irrigation cost (operating) of \$35 per acre" per year for surface methods; with nine applications per season this would mean \$3.89 per acre-inch. The same source says "a conservative figure for the total operating cost of spray irrigation is \$50 per acre per season." With depreciation and maintenance charges added to his figures, a Florida truck farmer reports sub-irrigation operating expenses per year as approximately \$75. F.E. Staebner tells of another eastern truck grower who was able to deliver one-inch applications^{1/} for \$3.00 per acre with the revolving sprinkler method.

C. INSTALLING AND OPERATING SMALL UNIT

The figures above, you will recall, refer to systems of one acre or more; for smaller units the expenditures should be considerably lower. Installation costs are less because long pipe lines are unfeasible and because most irrigators already possess equipment which can be used in small units. Operating charges are lower because — heads being smaller — less energy (fuel oil or electricity) is consumed and because — installation

^{1/} In comparing these figures with ours, incidentally, there is at least one other "grain of salt" which should be considered besides varying terrains, plot sizes, distances from water, etc. This additional factor is that varying actual amounts of water are required — because of waste in leakage, evaporation, spreading, etc. — to give an effective one-inch application. In our estimates, which refer to inches of effective water, allowance is made for this wastage. In the cited figures, different allowances are apt to be made; Staebner, for example, says that two inches of water are necessary for each effective one-inch application.

costs being smaller -- depreciation and interest items are not so large. This section presents "average-and-judgment" estimates for the small plots in manner similar to that used for the "bigger-than-an-acre" installations.

1. THE TOTAL INSTALLATION COST as explained in Section B, of any supplemental irrigation method is the sum of expenditures for two "constants", conveyance equipment and installation labor, and one available, distribution system. The following tables and comments aim to show how those same factors and relationships operate in determining probable installation costs on various small-plots units.

A. Cost of "Conveyance" Equipment -- Small Plots

Items	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	Remarks
1. <u>Pump</u> (horizontal centrifugal; 2" and smaller; when obtained can be used for other purpose against which part of cost has been charged)	\$ 35.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 20.00	Majority of farms not likely to have; those with farm plumbing systems do
2. <u>Motor</u> (2 horsepower and smaller; electric or gasoline; when obtained can be used for other purposes against which part of cost has been charged)	\$ 55.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 30.00	Many farms do have, including those with farm plumbing
3. <u>Conveyor Pipe</u> (1 1/2", 1 1/4" and 1" respectively; reckoned on 100' as upper limit of feasibility with small plots)	\$ 14.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 9.00	Most farms do not have; some have usable odds and ends which might cut cost by 1/3

These data were obtained from the following sources: (1) the results of the field work; (2) the results of the laboratory work; (3) the results of the theoretical work. The following tables give a summary of the data obtained from the field work. The data obtained from the laboratory work are given in the following tables. The data obtained from the theoretical work are given in the following tables.

Table 1. Results of field work.

Location	Time	Temperature	Humidity	Wind	Clouds
Station 1	10:00	25.0	75.0	1.0	1.0
Station 2	11:00	26.0	76.0	1.0	1.0
Station 3	12:00	27.0	77.0	1.0	1.0
Station 4	13:00	28.0	78.0	1.0	1.0
Station 5	14:00	29.0	79.0	1.0	1.0
Station 6	15:00	30.0	80.0	1.0	1.0
Station 7	16:00	31.0	81.0	1.0	1.0
Station 8	17:00	32.0	82.0	1.0	1.0
Station 9	18:00	33.0	83.0	1.0	1.0
Station 10	19:00	34.0	84.0	1.0	1.0
Station 11	20:00	35.0	85.0	1.0	1.0
Station 12	21:00	36.0	86.0	1.0	1.0
Station 13	22:00	37.0	87.0	1.0	1.0
Station 14	23:00	38.0	88.0	1.0	1.0
Station 15	24:00	39.0	89.0	1.0	1.0
Station 16	25:00	40.0	90.0	1.0	1.0
Station 17	26:00	41.0	91.0	1.0	1.0
Station 18	27:00	42.0	92.0	1.0	1.0
Station 19	28:00	43.0	93.0	1.0	1.0
Station 20	29:00	44.0	94.0	1.0	1.0
Station 21	30:00	45.0	95.0	1.0	1.0
Station 22	31:00	46.0	96.0	1.0	1.0
Station 23	32:00	47.0	97.0	1.0	1.0
Station 24	33:00	48.0	98.0	1.0	1.0
Station 25	34:00	49.0	99.0	1.0	1.0
Station 26	35:00	50.0	100.0	1.0	1.0
Station 27	36:00	51.0	101.0	1.0	1.0
Station 28	37:00	52.0	102.0	1.0	1.0
Station 29	38:00	53.0	103.0	1.0	1.0
Station 30	39:00	54.0	104.0	1.0	1.0
Station 31	40:00	55.0	105.0	1.0	1.0
Station 32	41:00	56.0	106.0	1.0	1.0
Station 33	42:00	57.0	107.0	1.0	1.0
Station 34	43:00	58.0	108.0	1.0	1.0
Station 35	44:00	59.0	109.0	1.0	1.0
Station 36	45:00	60.0	110.0	1.0	1.0
Station 37	46:00	61.0	111.0	1.0	1.0
Station 38	47:00	62.0	112.0	1.0	1.0
Station 39	48:00	63.0	113.0	1.0	1.0
Station 40	49:00	64.0	114.0	1.0	1.0
Station 41	50:00	65.0	115.0	1.0	1.0
Station 42	51:00	66.0	116.0	1.0	1.0
Station 43	52:00	67.0	117.0	1.0	1.0
Station 44	53:00	68.0	118.0	1.0	1.0
Station 45	54:00	69.0	119.0	1.0	1.0
Station 46	55:00	70.0	120.0	1.0	1.0
Station 47	56:00	71.0	121.0	1.0	1.0
Station 48	57:00	72.0	122.0	1.0	1.0
Station 49	58:00	73.0	123.0	1.0	1.0
Station 50	59:00	74.0	124.0	1.0	1.0
Station 51	60:00	75.0	125.0	1.0	1.0
Station 52	61:00	76.0	126.0	1.0	1.0
Station 53	62:00	77.0	127.0	1.0	1.0
Station 54	63:00	78.0	128.0	1.0	1.0
Station 55	64:00	79.0	129.0	1.0	1.0
Station 56	65:00	80.0	130.0	1.0	1.0
Station 57	66:00	81.0	131.0	1.0	1.0
Station 58	67:00	82.0	132.0	1.0	1.0
Station 59	68:00	83.0	133.0	1.0	1.0
Station 60	69:00	84.0	134.0	1.0	1.0
Station 61	70:00	85.0	135.0	1.0	1.0
Station 62	71:00	86.0	136.0	1.0	1.0
Station 63	72:00	87.0	137.0	1.0	1.0
Station 64	73:00	88.0	138.0	1.0	1.0
Station 65	74:00	89.0	139.0	1.0	1.0
Station 66	75:00	90.0	140.0	1.0	1.0
Station 67	76:00	91.0	141.0	1.0	1.0
Station 68	77:00	92.0	142.0	1.0	1.0
Station 69	78:00	93.0	143.0	1.0	1.0
Station 70	79:00	94.0	144.0	1.0	1.0
Station 71	80:00	95.0	145.0	1.0	1.0
Station 72	81:00	96.0	146.0	1.0	1.0
Station 73	82:00	97.0	147.0	1.0	1.0
Station 74	83:00	98.0	148.0	1.0	1.0
Station 75	84:00	99.0	149.0	1.0	1.0
Station 76	85:00	100.0	150.0	1.0	1.0
Station 77	86:00	101.0	151.0	1.0	1.0
Station 78	87:00	102.0	152.0	1.0	1.0
Station 79	88:00	103.0	153.0	1.0	1.0
Station 80	89:00	104.0	154.0	1.0	1.0
Station 81	90:00	105.0	155.0	1.0	1.0
Station 82	91:00	106.0	156.0	1.0	1.0
Station 83	92:00	107.0	157.0	1.0	1.0
Station 84	93:00	108.0	158.0	1.0	1.0
Station 85	94:00	109.0	159.0	1.0	1.0
Station 86	95:00	110.0	160.0	1.0	1.0
Station 87	96:00	111.0	161.0	1.0	1.0
Station 88	97:00	112.0	162.0	1.0	1.0
Station 89	98:00	113.0	163.0	1.0	1.0
Station 90	99:00	114.0	164.0	1.0	1.0
Station 91	100:00	115.0	165.0	1.0	1.0
Station 92	101:00	116.0	166.0	1.0	1.0
Station 93	102:00	117.0	167.0	1.0	1.0
Station 94	103:00	118.0	168.0	1.0	1.0
Station 95	104:00	119.0	169.0	1.0	1.0
Station 96	105:00	120.0	170.0	1.0	1.0
Station 97	106:00	121.0	171.0	1.0	1.0
Station 98	107:00	122.0	172.0	1.0	1.0
Station 99	108:00	123.0	173.0	1.0	1.0
Station 100	109:00	124.0	174.0	1.0	1.0
Station 101	110:00	125.0	175.0	1.0	1.0
Station 102	111:00	126.0	176.0	1.0	1.0
Station 103	112:00	127.0	177.0	1.0	1.0
Station 104	113:00	128.0	178.0	1.0	1.0
Station 105	114:00	129.0	179.0	1.0	1.0
Station 106	115:00	130.0	180.0	1.0	1.0
Station 107	116:00	131.0	181.0	1.0	1.0
Station 108	117:00	132.0	182.0	1.0	1.0
Station 109	118:00	133.0	183.0	1.0	1.0
Station 110	119:00	134.0	184.0	1.0	1.0
Station 111	120:00	135.0	185.0	1.0	1.0
Station 112	121:00	136.0	186.0	1.0	1.0
Station 113	122:00	137.0	187.0	1.0	1.0
Station 114	123:00	138.0	188.0	1.0	1.0
Station 115	124:00	139.0	189.0	1.0	1.0
Station 116	125:00	140.0	190.0	1.0	1.0
Station 117	126:00	141.0	191.0	1.0	1.0
Station 118	127:00	142.0	192.0	1.0	1.0
Station 119	128:00	143.0	193.0	1.0	1.0
Station 120	129:00	144.0	194.0	1.0	1.0
Station 121	130:00	145.0	195.0	1.0	1.0
Station 122	131:00	146.0	196.0	1.0	1.0
Station 123	132:00	147.0	197.0	1.0	1.0
Station 124	133:00	148.0	198.0	1.0	1.0
Station 125	134:00	149.0	199.0	1.0	1.0
Station 126	135:00	150.0	200.0	1.0	1.0
Station 127	136:00	151.0	201.0	1.0	1.0
Station 128	137:00	152.0	202.0	1.0	1.0
Station 129	138:00	153.0	203.0	1.0	1.0
Station 130	139:00	154.0	204.0	1.0	1.0
Station 131	140:00	155.0	205.0	1.0	1.0
Station 132	141:00	156.0	206.0	1.0	1.0
Station 133	142:00	157.0	207.0	1.0	1.0
Station 134	143:00	158.0	208.0	1.0	1.0
Station 135	144:00	159.0	209.0	1.0	1.0
Station 136	145:00	160.0	210.0	1.0	1.0
Station 137	146:00	161.0	211.0	1.0	1.0
Station 138	147:00	162.0	212.0	1.0	1.0
Station 139	148:00	163.0	213.0	1.0	1.0
Station 140	149:00	164.0	214.0	1.0	1.0
Station 141	150:00	165.0	215.0	1.0	1.0
Station 142	151:00	166.0	216.0	1.0	1.0
Station 143	152:00	167.0	217.0	1.0	1.0
Station 144	153:00	168.0	218.0	1.0	1.0
Station 145	154:00	169.0	219.0	1.0	1.0
Station 146	155:00	170.0	220.0	1.0	1.0
Station 147	156:00	171.0	221.0	1.0	1.0
Station 148	157:00	172.0	222.0	1.0	1.0
Station 149	158:00	173.0	223.0	1.0	1.0
Station 150	159:00	174.0	224.0	1.0	1.0
Station 151	160:00	175.0	225.0	1.0	1.0
Station 152	161:00	176.0	226.0	1.0	1.0
Station 153	162:00	177.0	227.0	1.0	1.0
Station 154	163:00	178.0	228.0	1.0	1.0
Station 155	164:00	179.0	229.0	1.0	1.0
Station 156	165:00	180.0	230.0	1.0	1.0
Station 157	166:00	181.0	231.0	1.0	1.0
Station 158	167:00	182.0	232.0	1.0	1.0
Station 159	168:00	183.0	233.0	1.0	1.0
Station 160	169:00	184.0	234.0	1.0	1.0
Station 161	170:00	185.0	235.0	1.0	1.0
Station 162	171:00	186.0	236.0	1.0	1.0
Station 163	172:00	187.0	237.0	1.0	1.0
Station 164	173:00	188.0	238.0	1.0	1.0
Station 165	174:00	189.0	239.0	1.0	1.0
Station 166	175:00	190.0	240.0	1.0	1.0
Station 167	176:00	191.0	241.0	1.0	1.0
Station 168	177:00	192.0	242.0	1.0	1.0
Station 169	178:00	193.0	243.0	1.0	1.0
Station 170	179:00	194.0	244.0	1.0	1.0
Station 171	180:00	195.0	245.0	1.0	1.0
Station 172	181:00	196.0	246.0	1.0	1.0
Station 173	182:00	197.0	247.0	1.0	1.0
Station 174	183:00	198.0	248.0	1.0	1.0
Station 175	184:00	199.0	249.0	1.0	1.0
Station 176	185:00	200.0	250.0	1.0	1.0
Station 177	186:00	201.0	251.0	1.0	1.0
Station 178	187:00	202.0	252.0	1.0	1.0
Station 179	188:00	203.0	253.0	1.0	1.0
Station 180	189:00	204.0	254.0	1.0	1.0
Station 181	190:00	205.0	255.0	1.0	1.0
Station 182	191:00	206.0	256.0	1.0	1.0
Station 183	192:00	207.0	257.0	1.0	1.0
Station 184	193:00	208.0	258.0	1.0	1.0
Station 185	194:00	209.0	259.0	1.0	1.0
Station 186	195:00	210.0	260.0	1.0	1.0
Station 187	196:00	211.0	261.0	1.0	1.0
Station 188	197:00	212.0	262.0	1.0	1.0
Station 189	198:00	213.0	263.0	1.0	1.0
Station 190	199:00	214.0	264.0	1.0	1.0
Station 191	200:00	215.0	265.0	1.0	1.0
Station 192	201:00	216.0	266.0	1.0	1.0
Station 193	202:00	217.0	267.0	1.0	1.0
Station 194	203:00	218.0	268.0	1.0	1.0
Station 195	204:00	219.0	269.0	1.0	1.0
Station 196	205:00	220.0	270.0	1.0	1.0
Station 197	206:00	221.0	271.0	1.0	1.0

Items	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	Remarks
4. <u>Miscellaneous Fittings</u> (Intake hose and screen; joints, etc.)	\$ 17.00	\$ 9.00	\$ 7.00	Most farms have some usable odds and ends which can cut cost by 1/3
5. <u>Installation Labor</u> (\$20 per hour)	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.10	\$.60	On plots of this size, a good share of in- stallation labor is done by farmer himself
6. <u>Totals "Conveyance"</u> <u>Equipment</u>				
1. All Expenditures Necessary.....	\$118.00	\$ 87.10	\$ 66.60	Rarely advisable to irrigate when this is case. Exceptions — very intensive crops grown
2. <u>Most Probable Neces- sary Expenditures</u> (Motor and 1/3 fit- tings already possessed; 1/2 labor not counted)	\$ 58.00	\$ 43.55	\$ 33.96	Irrigation profitable on most vegetable crops
3. <u>Probable Expenditures if Plumbing Already Installed</u> (Motor pump and 1/3 fittings possessed; 3/4 labor not counted)	\$ 22.50	\$ 18.27	\$ 13.81	Irrigation very profitable
4. <u>Probable Minimum Ex- penditures</u> (Motor, Pump, 1/3 Pipe and 1/3 fittings already possessed. No labor counted)	\$ 17.24	\$ 14.00	\$ 10.66	Irrigation very profitable

Several comments upon that table may bring out points which might otherwise be overlooked: 1. There has purposely been no mention made of dam or well-building because such expenditures — unless primarily

- 86 -

directed at something besides irrigation — would be absolutely too great financial burdens for one-acre plots. 2. Small-scale garden irrigation is actually more expensive per acre when a farmer happens to have no equipment at all on hand. 3. Within the one-acre category, the smaller the area irrigated, the greater becomes the cost in terms of one-acre units; this is so, of course, because reductions in acreage do not mean a proportionate reduction in expenditure for necessary equipment. Observe the following table:

b. "Distribution" Costs and Total Installation Expenditure — Small Plots

Methods	Installing Distribution Equipment			Most Like Total Installation Cost			Remarks
	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	
1. Subirrigation.....	\$ 250.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 68.00	\$ 307.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 101.66	Most of labor must be hired. Not usually feasible unless terrain "perfect" and very high priced crop
2. Furrow.....	\$ 5.50	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.75	\$ 63.50	\$ 46.55	\$ 35.21	Little hired labor necessary. Decreasing size brings nearly proportionate expenditure decrease. Good for hardy plants
3. Border.....	\$ 4.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 34.96	Not practicable for small plots. Some hired labor necessary

the one-act category, the smaller the area irrigated, the
 greater becomes the cost in terms of one-act units; this is so,
 of course, because the cost is not a constant, but varies
 inversely as the square of the distance from the source of
 water. Hence, the smaller the area irrigated, the greater the
 cost per unit of water.

Table 1. Cost of Water for Irrigation of One-Act Units

Distance from Source of Water (meters)	Cost of Water (one-act units per hectare)	
	100 meters	200 meters
100	1.00	0.25
200	0.25	0.06
300	0.11	0.03
400	0.06	0.02
500	0.04	0.01
600	0.03	0.01
700	0.02	0.01
800	0.02	0.01
900	0.01	0.01
1000	0.01	0.01

- 87 -

Methods	Installing Distribution Equipment			Most Like Total Installation Cost			Remarks
	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	1-acre	1/2-acre	1/4-acre	
4. Floor and Check.....	\$ 3.90	\$ 1.90	\$.95	\$ 41.90	\$ 45.45	\$ 34.91	Not practicable for small plots. Some hired labor necessary.
5. Permanent Overhead...	\$300.00	\$160.00	\$ 85.00	\$358.00	\$ 205.55	\$118.96	Too expensive for most small plots unless very high price product is much improved by irrigation.
6. Portable Overhead...	\$170.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 42.50	\$228.00	\$ 128.55	\$ 76.46	Practically all labor can be done by farmer. O.K. for "truck vegetable" specialists.
7. Revolving Sprinklers	\$ 75.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 19.50	\$133.00	\$ 81.55	\$ 54.46	Reasonable enough for most "irrigatable" crops. Installation labor can be largely done by proprietor.
8. Perforated Pipe.....	\$ 50.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 12.50	\$108.00	\$ 68.55	\$ 46.46	Good for row crops. Slightly cumbersome for small plots. No hired labor necessary.
9. Porous Hose	\$ 5.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 1.25	\$ 63.00	\$ 46.00	\$ 35.21	No hired labor necessary. Very good for small plots.

That table, too, can be clarified by several comments: 1. The "most-probable-conveyance-expenditure" figures are used in calculating the

Account	1940-1941			1941-1942			Total
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance	
Salaries and Wages	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
Travel	500.00	500.00	0.00	500.00	500.00	0.00	1,000.00
Postage	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	200.00
Telephone	200.00	200.00	0.00	200.00	200.00	0.00	400.00
Supplies	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
Repairs	500.00	500.00	0.00	500.00	500.00	0.00	1,000.00
Insurance	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
Utilities	500.00	500.00	0.00	500.00	500.00	0.00	1,000.00
Depreciation	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
Interest	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
Other	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
Total	25,000.00	25,000.00	0.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	0.00	50,000.00

This report was prepared by the Accounting Department of the City of New York, Office of the Comptroller, on the basis of the records of the City of New York, Office of the Comptroller, for the year ended December 31, 1941.

"most-likely-installation cost" estimates; if a farmer already has a complete plumbing system — or other equipment which makes possible fewer new purchases — his expenditures for a complete system will be much less. 2. Charges are included only for the labor that is likely to be hired; as mentioned previously, most farmers do not regard as an expense the return which their own efforts should get. 3. Consideration of smaller plots within the one-acre category show that "distribution" installation costs — as well as "conveyance" equipment expenditures — usually become higher per acre unit as area decreases. 4. As has been explained in regards to our other figures, the above statistics are purely estimates, with a tendency to be high. 5. Despite the "average-and-judgment" nature of the figures, however, they do have complete validity in one respect: showing the relative expense of the various methods.

Following the procedure used after the other tables we will cite the few available records of actual small-garden irrigation experiences to show how closely they compare with our estimates. Staebner tells of a small revolving-sprinkler installation which would cost — including expenditure for a motor — \$128 per acre. (Our estimate, without motor — \$133) A bulletin of the South Dakota Extension Service sets \$137.00 as the installation cost of a one-acre garden irrigation system using "furrow" distribution. (Subtracting the \$75 item which the bulletin includes as the expenditure for a gasoline motor, the remainder of \$62 compares

favorably with our estimate of \$63.50) A berry grower in Oregon paid \$67.96 for the equipment to undertake furrow irrigation of an acre of his crop.

2. HAVING WORKED OUT INSTALLATION COSTS, it is possible to make estimates of operating expenses on one-acre plots or smaller. The same factors are involved in this process as were explained in presenting the approximations for larger-than-an-acre systems.

Fertilizer	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
Water	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
Fuel	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
Labor	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
Interest	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
Total	100	200	300	400	500	600
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
						Estimated

the first part of the year (1944) the situation was not very

good, but in the second half of the year it improved

and the situation was better.

The situation in the second half of the year was better

than in the first half of the year, and the situation was

better in the second half of the year than in the first

half of the year, and the situation was better in the

second half of the year.

The situation in the second half of the year was better

than in the first half of the year, and the situation was

better in the second half of the year than in the first

half of the year, and the situation was better in the

second half of the year than in the first half of the

year, and the situation was better in the second half of

the year than in the first half of the year.

The situation in the second half of the year was better

than in the first half of the year, and the situation was

better in the second half of the year than in the first

half of the year, and the situation was better in the

second half of the year than in the first half of the

year, and the situation was better in the second half of

the year than in the first half of the year.

The situation in the second half of the year was better

than in the first half of the year, and the situation was

better in the second half of the year than in the first

Operating Charges — Small Plots

Method	Kind of Total	1-acre			1/2-acre			1/4-acre			Per acre on Large Plots			Remarks
		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch		
Subirrigation	a	\$60.97	\$6.77		\$39.92	\$4.44		\$22.91	\$2.57		\$77.15	\$8.57		High depreciation. Low operating (cost) expenses. Rarely feasible
	b	27.67	3.07		16.06	1.67		9.32	1.04		30.90	3.43		
	c	9.25	1.03		5.68	.63		3.22	.36		10.65	1.19		
	d	8.35	.93		5.14	.58		2.92	.32		10.24	1.14		
Furrow	a	16.17	1.80		10.75	1.19		7.57	.84		22.72	2.52		Depreciation not so large. Very inexpensive Good when there is slope
	b	9.54	1.06		5.94	.66		3.92	.44		12.90	1.43		
	c	5.73	.65		3.15	.35		1.81	.20		7.29	.81		
	d	4.03	.45		2.25	.25		1.31	.15		6.19	.69		
Border	a	14.45	1.61		9.84	1.09		6.97	.77		20.87	2.32		Least expensive method. Not well adapted, however, to small plots
	b	8.45	.94		5.38	.60		3.53	.39		11.84	1.32		
	c	4.73	.53		2.65	.30		1.43	.16		6.33	.70		
	d	3.73	.41		2.10	.23		1.13	.13		5.73	.64		
Flood	a	15.22	1.69		10.17	1.13		7.20	.80		21.50	2.39		Not well adapted to small plots. Requires even slope and certain crops
	b	9.03	1.00		5.62	.62		3.71	.41		12.22	1.36		
	c	5.31	.59		2.89	.32		1.62	.18		6.72	.77		
	d	3.81	.42		2.14	.24		1.24	.14		5.97	.66		
Permanent Overhead	a	49.82	5.54		28.57	3.17		16.96	1.88		56.49	6.28		Depreciation and labor rate relatively low. High installation cost makes operation expensive
	b	29.02	3.22		16.21	1.80		9.32	1.04		32.81	3.65		
	c	7.54	.84		4.00	.44		2.18	.24		9.76	1.08		
	d	6.64	.74		3.55	.39		1.96	.22		9.22	1.02		

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page		Page	Page	Page	Page	Page	Page	Page
	1	2							
Chapter 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Chapter 2	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Chapter 3	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Chapter 4	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
Chapter 5	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
Chapter 6	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54
Chapter 7	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63
Chapter 8	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72
Chapter 9	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81
Chapter 10	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
Chapter 11	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99
Chapter 12	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108
Chapter 13	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117
Chapter 14	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126
Chapter 15	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135
Chapter 16	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144
Chapter 17	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153
Chapter 18	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162
Chapter 19	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171
Chapter 20	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180
Chapter 21	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189
Chapter 22	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198
Chapter 23	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207
Chapter 24	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216
Chapter 25	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225
Chapter 26	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234
Chapter 27	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243
Chapter 28	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252
Chapter 29	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261
Chapter 30	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270
Chapter 31	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279
Chapter 32	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288
Chapter 33	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297
Chapter 34	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306
Chapter 35	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315
Chapter 36	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324
Chapter 37	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333
Chapter 38	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342
Chapter 39	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351
Chapter 40	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360
Chapter 41	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369
Chapter 42	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378
Chapter 43	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387
Chapter 44	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396
Chapter 45	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405
Chapter 46	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414
Chapter 47	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423
Chapter 48	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432
Chapter 49	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441
Chapter 50	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450
Chapter 51	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459
Chapter 52	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468
Chapter 53	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477
Chapter 54	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486
Chapter 55	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495
Chapter 56	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504
Chapter 57	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513
Chapter 58	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522
Chapter 59	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531
Chapter 60	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540
Chapter 61	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549
Chapter 62	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558
Chapter 63	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567
Chapter 64	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576
Chapter 65	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585
Chapter 66	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594
Chapter 67	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603
Chapter 68	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612
Chapter 69	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621
Chapter 70	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630
Chapter 71	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639
Chapter 72	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648
Chapter 73	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657
Chapter 74	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666
Chapter 75	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675
Chapter 76	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684
Chapter 77	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693
Chapter 78	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702
Chapter 79	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711
Chapter 80	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720
Chapter 81	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729
Chapter 82	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738
Chapter 83	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747
Chapter 84	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756
Chapter 85	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765
Chapter 86	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774
Chapter 87	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783
Chapter 88	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792
Chapter 89	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801
Chapter 90	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810
Chapter 91	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819
Chapter 92	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828
Chapter 93	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837
Chapter 94	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846
Chapter 95	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855
Chapter 96	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864
Chapter 97	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873
Chapter 98	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882
Chapter 99	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891
Chapter 100	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900

Operating Charges -- Small Plots
(Continued)

Method	Kind of total	1-acre			1/2-acre			1/4-acre			Per acre on Large Plots			Remarks
		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch		Per year	Per inch	Per acre	
Portable Overhead.....	a	44.27	4.92		24.70	2.74		14.49	1.61		51.17	5.69		Labor large item because of moving. Adapted to all terrains. Tears out faster than permanent
	b	4.87	2.76		13.54	1.50		7.40	.82		28.82	3.20		
	c	11.19	1.24		5.83	.65		2.81	.31		13.43	1.49		
	d	6.89	3.77		5.68	.41		1.72	.19		11.18	1.24		
Portable Revolving Sprinklers..	a	11.42	3.49		17.80	1.98		11.21	1.25		38.37	4.26		Moving laterals requires much labor. Adapted to all terrains. Good for small plots
	b	18.12	2.01		9.84	1.07		5.87	.65		22.14	2.46		
	c	10.14	1.13		4.75	.53		2.60	.29		12.46	1.38		
	d	6.64	.74		2.95	.33		1.65	.18		10.57	1.07		
Perforated Pipe.....	a	27.38	3.04		16.29	1.81		10.24	1.13		33.49	3.72		Moving pipes requires much labor. Little emergency needed. Can be used only for new crops
	b	16.58	1.84		9.43	1.05		5.60	.62		19.69	2.19		
	c	10.10	1.12		5.32	.59		2.81	.31		11.44	1.27		
	d	4.90	.54		2.67	.30		1.49	.17		8.74	.97		
Porous Hose.....	a	23.11	2.57		14.21	1.58		9.26	1.03		28.73	3.19		Much labor required to operate. Heavy rate of depreciation well adapted to small plots
	b	15.66	1.74		9.02	1.00		5.46	.61		18.15	2.02		
	c	11.88	1.32		6.26	.70		3.35	.37		12.60	1.51		
	d	5.88	.65		3.16	.35		1.75	.19		9.45	1.05		

UNIT 100 - MATHS - NUMBERS

	Tens				Hundreds				Thousands				Total	Notes
	100	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200		
100	100	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	12	100 is one hundred
200	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	13	200 is two hundred
300	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	14	300 is three hundred
400	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	15	400 is four hundred
500	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	16	500 is five hundred
600	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	17	600 is six hundred
700	700	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	18	700 is seven hundred
800	800	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	19	800 is eight hundred
900	900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	20	900 is nine hundred
1000	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	21	1000 is one thousand
1100	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	22	1100 is one thousand one hundred
1200	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	23	1200 is one thousand two hundred
1300	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24	1300 is one thousand three hundred
1400	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	25	1400 is one thousand four hundred
1500	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	26	1500 is one thousand five hundred
1600	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	27	1600 is one thousand six hundred
1700	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	28	1700 is one thousand seven hundred
1800	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	29	1800 is one thousand eight hundred
1900	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	30	1900 is one thousand nine hundred
2000	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	31	2000 is two thousand
2100	2100	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	32	2100 is two thousand one hundred
2200	2200	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	33	2200 is two thousand two hundred
2300	2300	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	34	2300 is two thousand three hundred
2400	2400	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	35	2400 is two thousand four hundred
2500	2500	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	36	2500 is two thousand five hundred
2600	2600	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	37	2600 is two thousand six hundred
2700	2700	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	38	2700 is two thousand seven hundred
2800	2800	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	39	2800 is two thousand eight hundred
2900	2900	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	40	2900 is two thousand nine hundred
3000	3000	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	41	3000 is three thousand
3100	3100	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	42	3100 is three thousand one hundred
3200	3200	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	43	3200 is three thousand two hundred
3300	3300	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	44	3300 is three thousand three hundred
3400	3400	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	45	3400 is three thousand four hundred
3500	3500	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	46	3500 is three thousand five hundred
3600	3600	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	47	3600 is three thousand six hundred
3700	3700	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	48	3700 is three thousand seven hundred
3800	3800	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	49	3800 is three thousand eight hundred
3900	3900	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	50	3900 is three thousand nine hundred
4000	4000	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	51	4000 is four thousand
4100	4100	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	52	4100 is four thousand one hundred
4200	4200	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	53	4200 is four thousand two hundred
4300	4300	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	54	4300 is four thousand three hundred
4400	4400	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	55	4400 is four thousand four hundred
4500	4500	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	56	4500 is four thousand five hundred
4600	4600	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	57	4600 is four thousand six hundred
4700	4700	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	58	4700 is four thousand seven hundred
4800	4800	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	59	4800 is four thousand eight hundred
4900	4900	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	60	4900 is four thousand nine hundred
5000	5000	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	61	5000 is five thousand
5100	5100	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	62	5100 is five thousand one hundred
5200	5200	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	63	5200 is five thousand two hundred
5300	5300	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	64	5300 is five thousand three hundred
5400	5400	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	65	5400 is five thousand four hundred
5500	5500	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	66	5500 is five thousand five hundred
5600	5600	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	67	5600 is five thousand six hundred
5700	5700	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	68	5700 is five thousand seven hundred
5800	5800	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	69	5800 is five thousand eight hundred
5900	5900	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	70	5900 is five thousand nine hundred
6000	6000	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	71	6000 is six thousand
6100	6100	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	72	6100 is six thousand one hundred
6200	6200	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	73	6200 is six thousand two hundred
6300	6300	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	74	6300 is six thousand three hundred
6400	6400	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	75	6400 is six thousand four hundred
6500	6500	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	76	6500 is six thousand five hundred
6600	6600	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	77	6600 is six thousand six hundred
6700	6700	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	78	6700 is six thousand seven hundred
6800	6800	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	79	6800 is six thousand eight hundred
6900	6900	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	80	6900 is six thousand nine hundred
7000	7000	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	81	7000 is seven thousand
7100	7100	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	82	7100 is seven thousand one hundred
7200	7200	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	83	7200 is seven thousand two hundred
7300	7300	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	84	7300 is seven thousand three hundred
7400	7400	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	85	7400 is seven thousand four hundred
7500	7500	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	86	7500 is seven thousand five hundred
7600	7600	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	87	7600 is seven thousand six hundred
7700	7700	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	88	7700 is seven thousand seven hundred
7800	7800	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	89	7800 is seven thousand eight hundred
7900	7900	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	90	7900 is seven thousand nine hundred
8000	8000	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	9100	91	8000 is eight thousand
8100	8100	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	9100	9200	92	8100 is eight thousand one hundred
8200	8200	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	9100	9200	9300	93	8200 is eight thousand two hundred
8300	8300	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	9100	9200	9300	9400	94	8300 is eight thousand three hundred
8400	8400	8500	8600	8700	8800	8900	9000	9100	9200	9300	9400	9500	95	8400 is eight thousand four hundred

Some of the comments applied to our other tabulations are among those which may help the reader in grasping the significance of the table on the two previous pages. As before, these figures are estimates with an intended bias towards being high but considerable accuracy in revealing the relative operating costs of various distributional methods. As before, these figures reemphasize the fact that supplemental irrigation is not to be had for picayunish sums; to be financially feasible it must effect marked increases in the production of high priced crops. Like large installations, the kitchen-garden systems tend to cost more, per given unit of land, as smaller areas are irrigated.

The other comments tend more towards being exclusively related to small-plot operation charges. In the first place, almost all the day-to-day labor is done by the irrigator himself without being considered an expense in money terms. Secondly, several methods seem somewhat unfeasible for irrigating the typical kitchen-garden installation because of high operating expenses, or lack of adaptability to various terraces or crops; subirrigation, permanent overhead irrigation, surface irrigation — particularly flood and border — may be in this group.

The previous table brings out at least one other important point: a comparison of operating costs on "one-acre-minus" plots and those on larger areas. This comparison reveals that —

and the same is true of the other two.

The paper is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

author, and he is now in the hands of the

- 93 -

despite the "smaller unit-higher cost" characteristics within both the large and small plot categories — a kitchen-garden system will probably cost less to establish and operate per acre than will a typical "larger-than-an-acre" installation. Such a situation prevails because the small systems are practically never put in unless water is very inexpensively available and partial equipment is already possessed by the irrigator.

As regards operating charges, the few published accounts of actual small plot irrigation contain little information. In "Irrigation in Western Washington" is a report of a six-tenths-acre permanent overhead installation with an operating cost of \$3.46 per inch coverage of water. (Our figure for 1/2 acre was \$3.17 per inch coverage of water.) "Garden Irrigation", a pamphlet put out by the Nebraska Agricultural College, says that the porous hose method — reckoned without depreciation, interest, and labor — will cost 36¢ for a one-inch coverage of water. (Our figure for 1/2 acre porous hose irrigation — reckoned as above — was 35¢ per inch coverage of water.) Calculations based on "Irrigating a One-Acre Garden", by Ralph L. Patty, would indicate \$2.70 per acre-inch as the cost of irrigating a small plot by the furrow method, when all equipment has to be purchased. (Our figure for this method on one-acre plots — assuming that some equipment does not have to be bought —

is \$1.80 per acre-inch.) Several statements in publications and letters sent out by the Ekinner Company point towards a probable operating cost of \$19.06 per season for a one-quarter-acre permanent overhead installation. (Our figure for a similar installation is \$16.96.)

D. GROSS AND NET RETURNS

The figures given so far in this chapter have revealed that supplemental irrigation does not cost an insignificant amount. It remains for this section to show that the increased returns from the practice more than compensate for that substantial cost. In the following paragraphs and tables, therefore, we will attempt to translate the crop results of irrigation -- larger quantity, better quality, more numerous crops per season, etc. -- into monetary terms corresponding to the cost statistics above.

1. The literature of the field is abundant with references to this phase of the subject -- the increased profits which irrigators have received. Application of the porous hose method to a forty-acre orchard in Ohio brought a net return of \$90 per acre, \$66.80 more per acre than was secured on non-irrigated land nearby. A. S. Colby, pomologist of Illinois Agriculture College, states that irrigation increases the value of strawberries at least \$50 -- enough to make the overhead system profitable -- even in years when rainfall conditions are best and berry prices are lowest. Various

check-plot experiments conducted at Ames, Iowa indicate that supplemental watering of tomatoes, onions, carrots and other garden plants will usually increase profits by more than 50 per cent. A.C.B. Bouget, professor of vegetable gardening in the Oregon State Agricultural College, found that irrigation of the following vegetables produced consistent increases in net value per acre: sweet corn \$79.00, late cabbage \$101.50, hubbard squash \$104.70. Another Oregon publication -- based on twenty-five years of study of supplemental irrigation on ten different crops in the humid part of the state -- gives \$8.80 as the average net increase in profits from using artificial watering. The following table summarizes the important facts, concerned with monetary return, on the preceding investigations and others.

Vegetable		Net value per acre	Net value per acre	Net value per acre	Net value per acre	Net value per acre	Net value per acre
Sweet corn							
Late cabbage							
Hubbard squash							
Tomatoes							
Onions							
Carrots							
Other vegetables							
Average							

Results of Supplemental Irrigation, Individual Experiments

Crop	Plot Description			Method	Crop increase per acre	Gross cash gain per acre	Net profit per acre	Gain in net profit per acre	State	Remarks
	Size	Distance from water	Terrain	Soil						
Spinach.....	4 ac.	?	Level	Sandy	233 crates	\$ 90.87		\$ 30.88	N.J.	Av. of 7 yrs.
Radishes.....	1/15 ac.		Level	Heavy loam	28%				Iowa	Av. of 6 yrs.
Carrots.....	1/15 ac.		Level	Heavy loam	70%				Iowa	Av. of 5 yrs.
Carrots.....			Rolling	Sandy	23.8 to 195%				Ore.	Results in especially dry year
Beets.....			Rolling	Sandy	4.6 to 114%				Ore.	Results in especially dry year
Beets.....			Rolling	Sandy	4.6 to 114%				Ore.	Results in especially dry year
Beets.....			Rolling	Sandy	4.6 to 114%				Ore.	Results in especially dry year
Beets.....	1/15 ac.		Level	Heavy loam	72%				Iowa	Av. of 6 yrs.

No.	Name	Family	Genus	Species	Cultivated	Native	Introduced	Remarks
1	Apple	Malaceae	Malus	Malus domestica	Yes	No	No	
2	Pear	Malaceae	Pyrus	Pyrus communis	Yes	No	No	
3	Quince	Malaceae	Cydonia	Cydonia oblonga	Yes	No	No	
4	Loquat	Malaceae	Eriobotrya	Eriobotrya japonica	Yes	No	No	
5	Japanese Quince	Malaceae	Malus	Malus baccata	Yes	No	No	
6	Chinese Quince	Malaceae	Malus	Malus asiatica	Yes	No	No	
7	Wax Apple	Malaceae	Eriobotrya	Eriobotrya caroliniana	Yes	No	No	
8	Red Flowering Quince	Malaceae	Malus	Malus spectabilis	Yes	No	No	
9	White Flowering Quince	Malaceae	Malus	Malus alba	Yes	No	No	
10	Spirea	Rosaceae	Spiraea	Spiraea alba	Yes	No	No	
11	Japanese Spirea	Rosaceae	Spiraea	Spiraea japonica	Yes	No	No	
12	Chinese Spirea	Rosaceae	Spiraea	Spiraea chinensis	Yes	No	No	
13	European Spirea	Rosaceae	Spiraea	Spiraea ulmaria	Yes	No	No	
14	Japanese Barberry	Rosaceae	Berberis	Berberis thunbergii	Yes	No	No	
15	Chinese Barberry	Rosaceae	Berberis	Berberis chinensis	Yes	No	No	
16	European Barberry	Rosaceae	Berberis	Berberis vulgaris	Yes	No	No	
17	Japanese Dogwood	Cornaceae	Cornus	Cornus japonica	Yes	No	No	
18	Chinese Dogwood	Cornaceae	Cornus	Cornus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
19	European Dogwood	Cornaceae	Cornus	Cornus alba	Yes	No	No	
20	Japanese Camellia	Camellia	Camellia	Camellia japonica	Yes	No	No	
21	Chinese Camellia	Camellia	Camellia	Camellia chinensis	Yes	No	No	
22	European Camellia	Camellia	Camellia	Camellia sasanqua	Yes	No	No	
23	Japanese Azalea	Ericaceae	Edgewoodia	Edgewoodia japonica	Yes	No	No	
24	Chinese Azalea	Ericaceae	Edgewoodia	Edgewoodia chinensis	Yes	No	No	
25	European Azalea	Ericaceae	Edgewoodia	Edgewoodia alba	Yes	No	No	
26	Japanese Forsythia	Hamamelidaceae	Forsythia	Forsythia japonica	Yes	No	No	
27	Chinese Forsythia	Hamamelidaceae	Forsythia	Forsythia chinensis	Yes	No	No	
28	European Forsythia	Hamamelidaceae	Forsythia	Forsythia viridissima	Yes	No	No	
29	Japanese Weigela	Caprifoliaceae	Weigela	Weigela japonica	Yes	No	No	
30	Chinese Weigela	Caprifoliaceae	Weigela	Weigela chinensis	Yes	No	No	
31	European Weigela	Caprifoliaceae	Weigela	Weigela florida	Yes	No	No	
32	Japanese Philadelphus	Rubaceae	Philadelphus	Philadelphus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
33	Chinese Philadelphus	Rubaceae	Philadelphus	Philadelphus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
34	European Philadelphus	Rubaceae	Philadelphus	Philadelphus coronarius	Yes	No	No	
35	Japanese Viburnum	Viburnaceae	Viburnum	Viburnum japonicum	Yes	No	No	
36	Chinese Viburnum	Viburnaceae	Viburnum	Viburnum chinensis	Yes	No	No	
37	European Viburnum	Viburnaceae	Viburnum	Viburnum opulus	Yes	No	No	
38	Japanese Syringa	Simarubaceae	Syringa	Syringa japonica	Yes	No	No	
39	Chinese Syringa	Simarubaceae	Syringa	Syringa chinensis	Yes	No	No	
40	European Syringa	Simarubaceae	Syringa	Syringa vulgaris	Yes	No	No	
41	Japanese Ligustrum	Simarubaceae	Ligustrum	Ligustrum japonicum	Yes	No	No	
42	Chinese Ligustrum	Simarubaceae	Ligustrum	Ligustrum chinensis	Yes	No	No	
43	European Ligustrum	Simarubaceae	Ligustrum	Ligustrum ovalifolium	Yes	No	No	
44	Japanese Eubankia	Simarubaceae	Eubankia	Eubankia japonica	Yes	No	No	
45	Chinese Eubankia	Simarubaceae	Eubankia	Eubankia chinensis	Yes	No	No	
46	European Eubankia	Simarubaceae	Eubankia	Eubankia alba	Yes	No	No	
47	Japanese Abutilon	Malvaceae	Abutilon	Abutilon japonicum	Yes	No	No	
48	Chinese Abutilon	Malvaceae	Abutilon	Abutilon chinensis	Yes	No	No	
49	European Abutilon	Malvaceae	Abutilon	Abutilon stramonium	Yes	No	No	
50	Japanese Hibiscus	Malvaceae	Hibiscus	Hibiscus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
51	Chinese Hibiscus	Malvaceae	Hibiscus	Hibiscus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
52	European Hibiscus	Malvaceae	Hibiscus	Hibiscus syriacus	Yes	No	No	
53	Japanese Anemone	Ranunculaceae	Anemone	Anemone japonica	Yes	No	No	
54	Chinese Anemone	Ranunculaceae	Anemone	Anemone chinensis	Yes	No	No	
55	European Anemone	Ranunculaceae	Anemone	Anemone pulsatilla	Yes	No	No	
56	Japanese Paeonia	Paeoniaceae	Paeonia	Paeonia japonica	Yes	No	No	
57	Chinese Paeonia	Paeoniaceae	Paeonia	Paeonia chinensis	Yes	No	No	
58	European Paeonia	Paeoniaceae	Paeonia	Paeonia officinalis	Yes	No	No	
59	Japanese Clematis	Ranunculaceae	Clematis	Clematis japonica	Yes	No	No	
60	Chinese Clematis	Ranunculaceae	Clematis	Clematis chinensis	Yes	No	No	
61	European Clematis	Ranunculaceae	Clematis	Clematis integrifolia	Yes	No	No	
62	Japanese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
63	Chinese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
64	European Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus acris	Yes	No	No	
65	Japanese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium japonicum	Yes	No	No	
66	Chinese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium chinensis	Yes	No	No	
67	European Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium elatum	Yes	No	No	
68	Japanese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum japonicum	Yes	No	No	
69	Chinese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum chinensis	Yes	No	No	
70	European Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum napellus	Yes	No	No	
71	Japanese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis japonica	Yes	No	No	
72	Chinese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis chinensis	Yes	No	No	
73	European Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis vernalis	Yes	No	No	
74	Japanese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
75	Chinese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
76	European Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus acris	Yes	No	No	
77	Japanese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium japonicum	Yes	No	No	
78	Chinese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium chinensis	Yes	No	No	
79	European Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium elatum	Yes	No	No	
80	Japanese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum japonicum	Yes	No	No	
81	Chinese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum chinensis	Yes	No	No	
82	European Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum napellus	Yes	No	No	
83	Japanese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis japonica	Yes	No	No	
84	Chinese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis chinensis	Yes	No	No	
85	European Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis vernalis	Yes	No	No	
86	Japanese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
87	Chinese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
88	European Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus acris	Yes	No	No	
89	Japanese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium japonicum	Yes	No	No	
90	Chinese Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium chinensis	Yes	No	No	
91	European Delphinium	Belladoniaceae	Delphinium	Delphinium elatum	Yes	No	No	
92	Japanese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum japonicum	Yes	No	No	
93	Chinese Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum chinensis	Yes	No	No	
94	European Aconitum	Belladoniaceae	Aconitum	Aconitum napellus	Yes	No	No	
95	Japanese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis japonica	Yes	No	No	
96	Chinese Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis chinensis	Yes	No	No	
97	European Adonis	Belladoniaceae	Adonis	Adonis vernalis	Yes	No	No	
98	Japanese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus japonicus	Yes	No	No	
99	Chinese Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus chinensis	Yes	No	No	
100	European Ranunculus	Ranunculaceae	Ranunculus	Ranunculus acris	Yes	No	No	

Results of Supplemental Irrigation, Individual Experiments
(continued)

Crop	Plot Description			Method	Crop increase per acre	Gross cash gain per acre	Net profit per acre	Gain in net profit per acre	State	Remarks
	Distance from water	Terrain	Soil							
Kale.....		Sloping	Silt loam	Furrow	3.4 to 22%	\$ 17.00			Wash.	Av. of 20 yrs
Squash.....	1 ac.	Level	Sandy loam	Perma- nent over- head	4 to 66 2/3%	\$120.00		\$104.70	N.J.	Only labor and en- ergy figured in cost
Cabbage.....	1 ac.	Rolling	Sandy	Perma- nent over- head	6 to 75%	\$120.00		\$101.50	Ind.	Same as item above
Cabbage.....		Sloping		Furrow				\$208.40	Ore.	Same
Sweet Corn..		Level		Flood				\$ 58.50	Ore.	Same
Sweet Corn..	1 ac.	Sloping		Furrow		\$101.00		\$ 79.00	Wash.	Same
Sweet corn..	1 ac.			Perma- nent over- head	645 da. 110%	\$ 77.75		\$ 65.18	Wash.	Same
Tomatoes....			heavy loam	Perma- nent over- head	500%				Fla.	Unusually high gain

Results of Supplemental Irrigation, Individual Experiments
(continued)

Crop	Plot Description			Method	Crop increase per acre	Gross cash gain per acre	Net profit per acre	Gain in net profit per acre	State	Remarks
	Distance from water	Size	Terrain	Soil						
Tomatoes...				Sandy loam	Permanent overhead	5 to			N.J.	Unusually high gain 4 yr.av.
Tomatoes...					Permanent overhead	4 to			Wisc.	Av. gain per yr. for 7 yrs.
Tomatoes...	250'	6/10 ac.	Level	Clay loam	Permanent overhead	39%	\$144.70	\$7.10	Ore.	
Tomatoes...		1/15 ac.	Level	Heavy loam	Permanent overhead	42%			Io.	av. gain per yr. for 6 yrs.
Onions.....					Flood	153 bu. 75%			Mich.	Quality much improved
Onions.....		1/15 ac.	Level	Heavy loam	Permanent overhead	70%			Io.	Av. per yr. for 6 yrs.
Beans.....			Sloping	Sandy loam	Plow	4.91 bu. 48%	\$21.87	\$10.91	Ore.	Av. of 21 yrs.

Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the [Company Name]

Item	Description	Amount	Date	By	To	Total		Remarks
						Debit	Credit	
1	Jan 1	100.00						Balance
2	Jan 15	50.00						
3	Jan 30	25.00						
4	Feb 1	10.00						
5	Feb 15	75.00						
6	Feb 28	30.00						
7	Mar 1	15.00						
8	Mar 15	40.00						
9	Mar 31	20.00						
10	Apr 1	10.00						
11	Apr 15	60.00						
12	Apr 30	35.00						
13	May 1	15.00						
14	May 15	45.00						
15	May 31	25.00						
16	Jun 1	10.00						
17	Jun 15	55.00						
18	Jun 30	30.00						
19	Jul 1	15.00						
20	Jul 15	40.00						
21	Jul 31	20.00						
22	Aug 1	10.00						
23	Aug 15	65.00						
24	Aug 30	35.00						
25	Sep 1	15.00						
26	Sep 15	45.00						
27	Sep 30	25.00						
28	Oct 1	10.00						
29	Oct 15	55.00						
30	Oct 30	30.00						
31	Nov 1	15.00						
32	Nov 15	40.00						
33	Nov 30	20.00						
34	Dec 1	10.00						
35	Dec 15	60.00						
36	Dec 30	35.00						
37	Total							

Results of Supplemental Irrigation. Individual Experiments
(Continued)

Crop	Plot Description			Method	Crop increase per acre	Gross cash gain per acre	Net profit per acre	Gain in net profit per acre	State	Remarks
	Size	Distance from water	Terrain	Soil						
String beans					Revolving sprinkler	5122 lbs. 340%			Ore.	Unusually good results
Lima beans			Level	Heavy loam	Permanent overhead	None			Io.	Good yield without irrigating
Potatoes			Level	Muck	Subirrigation	134 bu. 63%			Ohio	Increase in quality
Potatoes			Level	Muck	Permanent overhead	123 bu. 61%			Ohio	Same
Potatoes		450'	Sloping	Sandy loam	Furrow	59 bu. 42%	\$45.27	\$15.27	Ore.	Same
Potatoes	2.3				Furrow	213.8 bu. 230%			Meab.	Same
Corn		450'	Sloping	Sandy	Furrow	2.46 to 38%	\$13.93	\$ 1.58	Ore.	Same
										Not one of best adapted crops

Results of Supplemental Irrigation, Individual Experiments
(Continued)

Crop	Plot Description			Method	Crop increase per acre	Gross cash gain per acre	Net profit per acre	Gain in net profit per acre	State	Remarks
	Size	Distance from water	Terrain	Soil						
Muskmelon.	---	---	---	---	72.4%	---	---	---	Io.	---
Sweet potatoes..	---	---	---	---	35.3%	---	---	---	Io.	Decided increase in quality
Strawberries.	---	---	---	---	2582 lbs. 82.4%	\$203.32	\$181.21	\$ 94.81	Ore.	---
Strawberries.	---	---	---	---	62%	---	---	---	Rich	More net because less cost
Raspberries.	---	---	---	---	2599 58.4%	\$123.10	\$261.76	\$120.35	Ore.	Adapted well to irrigation
Alfalfa.....	---	---	---	---	5.11 to 61%	\$ 22.10	\$ 28.38	\$ 7.18	Ore.	More so well adapted in more humid states

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
 (Library)

No.	Date	Description	1911				Total	Balance
			Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr		
1	1/1	Balance						
2	1/1	Income						
3	1/1	Expenses						
4	1/1	Income						
5	1/1	Expenses						
6	1/1	Income						
7	1/1	Expenses						
8	1/1	Income						
9	1/1	Expenses						
10	1/1	Income						
11	1/1	Expenses						
12	1/1	Income						
13	1/1	Expenses						
14	1/1	Income						
15	1/1	Expenses						
16	1/1	Income						
17	1/1	Expenses						
18	1/1	Income						
19	1/1	Expenses						
20	1/1	Income						
21	1/1	Expenses						
22	1/1	Income						
23	1/1	Expenses						
24	1/1	Income						
25	1/1	Expenses						
26	1/1	Income						
27	1/1	Expenses						
28	1/1	Income						
29	1/1	Expenses						
30	1/1	Income						
31	1/1	Expenses						
32	1/1	Income						
33	1/1	Expenses						
34	1/1	Income						
35	1/1	Expenses						
36	1/1	Income						
37	1/1	Expenses						
38	1/1	Income						
39	1/1	Expenses						
40	1/1	Income						
41	1/1	Expenses						
42	1/1	Income						
43	1/1	Expenses						
44	1/1	Income						
45	1/1	Expenses						
46	1/1	Income						
47	1/1	Expenses						
48	1/1	Income						
49	1/1	Expenses						
50	1/1	Income						
51	1/1	Expenses						
52	1/1	Income						
53	1/1	Expenses						
54	1/1	Income						
55	1/1	Expenses						
56	1/1	Income						
57	1/1	Expenses						
58	1/1	Income						
59	1/1	Expenses						
60	1/1	Income						
61	1/1	Expenses						
62	1/1	Income						
63	1/1	Expenses						
64	1/1	Income						
65	1/1	Expenses						
66	1/1	Income						
67	1/1	Expenses						
68	1/1	Income						
69	1/1	Expenses						
70	1/1	Income						
71	1/1	Expenses						
72	1/1	Income						
73	1/1	Expenses						
74	1/1	Income						
75	1/1	Expenses						
76	1/1	Income						
77	1/1	Expenses						
78	1/1	Income						
79	1/1	Expenses						
80	1/1	Income						
81	1/1	Expenses						
82	1/1	Income						
83	1/1	Expenses						
84	1/1	Income						
85	1/1	Expenses						
86	1/1	Income						
87	1/1	Expenses						
88	1/1	Income						
89	1/1	Expenses						
90	1/1	Income						
91	1/1	Expenses						
92	1/1	Income						
93	1/1	Expenses						
94	1/1	Income						
95	1/1	Expenses						
96	1/1	Income						
97	1/1	Expenses						
98	1/1	Income						
99	1/1	Expenses						
100	1/1	Income						

The most obvious and most important conclusion made plain by the above tabulation is that supplemental irrigation is generally profitable on a very wide range of crops. This holds quite true no matter what the method, the type of soil, or the section of the humid regions. If the figures we have compiled are representative, there appears to be an average increase in crop yield of 78 per cent and in net profit per acre of \$66.21.

Paralleling that statement of general profitability, however, it seems well to "point up" several characteristics of the table which may indicate that a good share of the individual items are slightly too optimistic. In the first place, more of the profit figures have been calculated without considering any charges but labor and energy. Secondly, chiefly the more successful undertakings in humid region irrigation have found their way into print and subsequently into the above tabulation. Thirdly, much of the material in the table has resulted from agricultural research experiments conducted with more careful cultivation practices than most run-of-the-mill growers feel obliged to employ. In a later table of "average-and-judgment" estimates of the returns from irrigation, these three small modifying considerations are given some weight.

Another conclusion for which the above tabulation furnishes some basis is that supplemental irrigation — granting the general

The first thing we noticed when we stepped out of the plane was the heat. It was a relief after the cool air of the plane, but it was still a bit of a shock. The sun was shining brightly, and the air was thick with humidity.

As we walked through the airport, we noticed that the people here were very friendly. They greeted us with smiles and waves. We were told that this was a very safe place to visit. The police were very helpful, and they made sure we had everything we needed. We were also told that the food was very good, and we were looking forward to trying it.

We stayed in a very nice hotel. The room was comfortable, and the service was excellent. We were also told that the hotel was very safe, and we were looking forward to staying there. We were also told that the hotel was very clean, and we were looking forward to staying there. We were also told that the hotel was very nice, and we were looking forward to staying there.

After a few days, we decided to go to the beach. The beach was very beautiful, and the water was very clear. We were told that the beach was very safe, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very nice, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very clean, and we were looking forward to going there.

We were also told that the beach was very nice, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very clean, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very safe, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very nice, and we were looking forward to going there.

We were also told that the beach was very nice, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very clean, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very safe, and we were looking forward to going there. We were also told that the beach was very nice, and we were looking forward to going there.

benefits of the practice -- raises the financial returns from some crops more than it does from others. Truck-crops -- particularly spinach, lettuce, beets, carrots, onions, string beans, etc. -- and fruits -- strawberries, raspberries and apples for example -- are very well suited to artificial watering. Field crops -- like oats, buckwheat, corn, etc. -- and exceptionally handy plants -- such as lima beans, asparagus, peppers, etc. -- usually do not benefit greatly from irrigation in normal seasons. Putting it briefly, crops which sell for high prices in eager markets or fail badly and quickly in time of droughts, are the ones to which supplemental watering can be most profitably devoted.

Still another characteristic of the financial returns from supplemental irrigation is the great number of matters, besides kind of crop grown, which influence the degree of increased profit. Among the most important of these matters are: method of distribution, amount of natural precipitation, area of the plot being irrigated, distance of the plot from water. Other determining factors include the type of soil and terrain, the length and warmth of the growing season, the general cultivation skill and irrigation experience of the grower, the interest rate and kind of energy used.

Because the number and variability of these influencing factors makes the increase on profits from supplemental irrigation anything from 1 per cent to 1,000 per cent, not too

much significance should be attached to any possible publications of average or most likely returns. Such a tabulation for certain crops is presented below, however, since it enables us — through the medium of "average-and-judgment" estimates — to give some weight to minor considerations modifying here and there the optimistic picture presented by the above citation of actual cases and since it furnishes a needed tool for comparing returns with "average-and-judgment" estimates of "most likely operating costs". This table is based mainly on actual figures — those above and others — and presents a carefully considered judgment of the most likely returns from irrigating under the most likely conditions of soil, weather, etc. Things to keep in mind while considering that table include these: figures represent the optimum relationship between the decreasing returns from more water and decreasing cost of more water; the "returns" from kitchen-garden installations may manifest themselves as savings on what has to be spent for food or as cash when there is a roadside stand.

side stand.									
							</		

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation

Crop	Designation of figures	Sub-irrigation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Permeant overhead	Portable overhead	Revolving sprinkler	Perforated pipe	Porous hose	Water
Spinach	2 Gross, P.A.I.	\$ 11.40	\$ 7.00	\$	\$	\$ 10.15	\$ 10.00	\$ 9.60	\$	\$ 8.10	7
	3 Com. Cost P.A.I.	10.55	3.10			7.73	7.00	5.24		3.93	
	4 Com. Net P.A.I.	.85	3.90			2.42	3.00	4.36		4.17	
	5 Com. Net P.A.	5.95	27.30			16.94	21.00	30.52		29.19	
	6 K.G. Cost P.A.I.	8.33	2.22			6.81	5.95	4.30		3.16	
	7 K.G. Net P.A.I.	3.07	4.78			3.34	4.05	5.30		4.94	
	8 K.G. Net P.A.	21.49	33.46			23.38	28.35	37.10		34.58	

1. Meter — Optimum inches of irrigation water during typical season.
2. Gross, P.A.I. — Likely gross increase in returns per acre-inch of irrigation.
3. Com. Cost, P.A.I. — Likely cost for acre-inch of water on commercial-sized plots.
4. Com. Net, P.A.I. — Likely net increase in returns per acre-inch on commercial-sized plots.
5. Com. Net, P.A. — Likely net increase in returns per acre on commercial-sized plots.
6. K.G. Cost, P.A.I. — Likely cost for acre-inch of water on "kitchen-garden" plots.
7. K.G. Net, P.A.I. — Likely net increase in returns per acre-inch on "kitchen-garden" plots.
8. K.G. Net, P.A. — Likely net increase in returns per acre on "kitchen-garden" plots.

United States Government

Year	Month	Day	Hour	Minute	Second	Latitude	Longitude	Altitude	Remarks
1900	Jan	1	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	2	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	3	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	4	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	5	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	6	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	7	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	8	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	9	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	10	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	11	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	12	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	13	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	14	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	15	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	16	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	17	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	18	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	19	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	20	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	21	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	22	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	23	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	24	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	25	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	26	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	27	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	28	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	29	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	30	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear
1900	Jan	31	12	00	00	37° 15' N	122° 45' W	100 ft	Clear

The following table shows the results of the observations made during the month of January, 1900, at the station located at 37° 15' N latitude and 122° 45' W longitude, at an altitude of 100 feet. The observations were made during the hours of 12:00 to 12:00, and the results are given in the table above. The observations were made during the hours of 12:00 to 12:00, and the results are given in the table above.

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

Crop	Designation of figures	Sub-irrigation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Permanent overhead	Portable overhead	Revolving sprinkler	Perforated pipe	Porous hose	Water ¹
Radishes	Gross, P.A.I.	\$ 6.20	\$ 5.60			\$ 6.80	\$ 6.60	\$ 6.60		\$ 6.50	
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	10.55	3.10			7.73	7.00	5.24		3.93	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	-4.35	2.50			-.93	-.40	1.36		2.57	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.	-30.45	17.50			-6.51	-2.80	9.52		17.99	
	K.G. Cost										
	P.A.I.	8.33	2.22			6.81	3.95	4.50		3.16	
	K.G. Net										
Carrots	P.A.I.	-2.13	3.38			-.01	.65	2.30		3.34	
	K.G. Net										
	P.A.	-14.91	23.66			-.07	4.55	16.10		22.38	
	Gross, P.A.I.	12.50	9.00			13.15	12.95	13.00		11.95	
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	7.82	2.30			5.73	5.19	3.89		2.91	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	4.68	6.70			7.42	7.76	9.11		9.04	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.	46.80	67.00			74.20	77.60	91.10		90.40	
Carrots	K.G. Cost										
	P.A.I.	6.18	1.64			5.05	4.49	3.18		2.34	
	K.G. Net										
	P.A.I.	6.32	7.36			8.10	8.46	9.82		9.61	
	K.G. Net										
	P.A.	63.20	73.60			81.00	84.60	98.20		96.10	
	Gross, P.A.I.										
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.										
	K.G. Net										

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation
(Continued)

Crop	Designation of figures	Sub-irrigation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Permeant over-ear	Portable over-head	Revolving sprinkler	Perforated pipe	Porous hose	Water
Beets	Gross, P.A.I.	10.90	9.00	8.50	8.50	11.10	10.90	11.00	9.40	9.60	7
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	10.55	3.10	2.85	2.94	7.73	7.00	5.24	4.58	3.93	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	.35	5.90	5.65	5.56	3.37	3.90	5.76	4.82	5.67	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.	2.45	41.30	38.85	38.92	23.59	27.30	40.32	33.74	39.69	
Kale	Gross, P.A.I.	8.33	2.22	1.98	2.08	6.81	5.95	4.30	3.74	3.16	7
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	2.57	6.78	6.52	6.42	4.29	4.95	6.70	5.66	6.44	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	17.99	47.46	45.64	44.94	30.03	34.65	46.90	39.62	45.08	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.										
Kale	Gross, P.A.I.	7.15	6.65	5.55	6.47	7.00	6.85	6.90	6.20	5.40	7
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	10.55	3.10	2.85	2.94	7.73	7.00	5.24	4.58	3.93	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	3.40	3.55	3.70	3.53	-73	-15	1.66	1.62	2.47	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.	-23.80	24.85	25.90	21.77	-5.11	-1.05	11.62	11.34	17.29	
Kale	Gross, P.A.I.	8.33	2.22	1.98	2.08	6.81	5.95	4.30	3.74	3.16	7
	Con. Cost										
	P.A.I.	-1.18	4.43	4.57	4.39	.19	.90	2.60	2.46	3.24	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.I.	-8.26	31.01	31.99	30.73	1.33	6.30	18.20	17.22	22.68	
	Con. Net										
	P.A.										

...

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

Crop	Designa- tion of figures	Sub-irri- gation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Perma- nent over- head	Portable over- head	Revolv- ing sprink- ler	Perfora- ted pipe	Porous hose	Water
Squash	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost	\$ 7.90	\$			\$ 9.00	\$ 6.70	\$ 8.85	\$		
	P.A.I. Com.Net	8.57				6.28	5.69	4.26			
	P.A.I. Com.Net	- .67				2.72	3.01	4.59			
	P.A. Com.Net	- 6.03				24.48	27.09	41.31			
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.77				5.54	4.92	3.49			
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	1.13				3.46	3.78	5.36			
	K.G.Net P.A.	10.17				31.14	34.02	48.24			
	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost	8.20	7.95	8.00	8.00	9.15	9.00	9.10	8.40	8.55	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	8.57	2.52	2.32	2.39	6.28	5.69	4.26	3.72	3.19	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	- .37	5.43	5.68	5.61	2.87	3.31	4.84	4.68	5.36	
Cabbage	P.A. Com.Cost	-3.33	48.87	51.12	50.49	25.83	29.79	43.56	42.12	48.24	
	K.C.Cost P.A.I.	6.77	1.00	1.61	1.69	5.54	4.92	3.49	3.04	2.57	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	1.43	6.15	6.39	6.31	3.61	4.08	5.61	5.36	5.98	
	K.G.Net P.A.	27.87	55.35	57.51	56.79	32.49	36.72	50.49	48.24	53.82	

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation
(Continued)

Crop	Designa- tion of figures	Sub-irri- gation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Perma- nent over- head	Portable over- head	Revolv- ing sprink- ler	Perfora- ted pipe	Porous hose	Water
Sweet Corn	Gross, P.A.I.	\$ 7.20	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.45	\$ 7.40	\$ 8.00	\$ 7.20		7.90	\$ 8.00	9
	Con. Cost P.A.I.	8.57	2.52	2.32	2.39	6.28	5.69		3.72	3.19	
	Con. Net P.A.I.	-1.37	5.08	5.23	5.01	1.72	1.51		4.18	4.81	
	Con. Net P.A.	-12.33	45.72	47.07	45.09	15.48	13.59		37.62	43.59	
	K.G. Cost P.A.I.	6.77	1.80	1.61	1.69	5.54	4.92		3.04	2.57	
	K.G. Net P.A.I.	.43	5.80	5.84	5.71	2.46	2.28		4.86	5.43	
	K.G. Net P.A.	3.87	52.20	52.56	51.39	22.14	20.52		43.74	48.57	
Tomatoes	Gross, P.A.I.	6.90	9.70			10.45	10.30	\$ 10.50	9.90	10.00	10
	Con. Cost P.A.I.	7.62	2.30			5.73	5.19	1.79	3.39	1.91	
	Con. Net P.A.I.	-7.92	7.40			4.72	5.11	8.61	6.41	7.09	
	Con. Net P.A.	-9.20	74.00			47.20	51.10	66.10	64.10	70.90	
	K.G. Cost P.A.I.	6.18	1.54			5.05	4.49	3.14	2.77	2.34	
	K.G. Net P.A.I.	.72	8.06			5.40	5.41	7.32	7.03	7.46	
	K.G. Net P.A.	7.20	80.50			54.00	58.10	73.20	70.30	76.60	

RECORD OF STUDENT'S WORK
NAME

DATE	PERIOD	REMARKS	SCORE	GRADE	TEACHER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
1901	1		100	A		
1901	2		100	A		
1901	3		100	A		
1901	4		100	A		
1901	5		100	A		
1901	6		100	A		
1901	7		100	A		
1901	8		100	A		
1901	9		100	A		
1901	10		100	A		
1901	11		100	A		
1901	12		100	A		
1901	13		100	A		
1901	14		100	A		
1901	15		100	A		
1901	16		100	A		
1901	17		100	A		
1901	18		100	A		
1901	19		100	A		
1901	20		100	A		
1901	21		100	A		
1901	22		100	A		
1901	23		100	A		
1901	24		100	A		
1901	25		100	A		
1901	26		100	A		
1901	27		100	A		
1901	28		100	A		
1901	29		100	A		
1901	30		100	A		
1901	31		100	A		
1901	32		100	A		
1901	33		100	A		
1901	34		100	A		
1901	35		100	A		
1901	36		100	A		
1901	37		100	A		
1901	38		100	A		
1901	39		100	A		
1901	40		100	A		
1901	41		100	A		
1901	42		100	A		
1901	43		100	A		
1901	44		100	A		
1901	45		100	A		
1901	46		100	A		
1901	47		100	A		
1901	48		100	A		
1901	49		100	A		
1901	50		100	A		
1901	51		100	A		
1901	52		100	A		
1901	53		100	A		
1901	54		100	A		
1901	55		100	A		
1901	56		100	A		
1901	57		100	A		
1901	58		100	A		
1901	59		100	A		
1901	60		100	A		
1901	61		100	A		
1901	62		100	A		
1901	63		100	A		
1901	64		100	A		
1901	65		100	A		
1901	66		100	A		
1901	67		100	A		
1901	68		100	A		
1901	69		100	A		
1901	70		100	A		
1901	71		100	A		
1901	72		100	A		
1901	73		100	A		
1901	74		100	A		
1901	75		100	A		
1901	76		100	A		
1901	77		100	A		
1901	78		100	A		
1901	79		100	A		
1901	80		100	A		
1901	81		100	A		
1901	82		100	A		
1901	83		100	A		
1901	84		100	A		
1901	85		100	A		
1901	86		100	A		
1901	87		100	A		
1901	88		100	A		
1901	89		100	A		
1901	90		100	A		
1901	91		100	A		
1901	92		100	A		
1901	93		100	A		
1901	94		100	A		
1901	95		100	A		
1901	96		100	A		
1901	97		100	A		
1901	98		100	A		
1901	99		100	A		
1901	100		100	A		

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

Crop	Designation of figures	Sub-irrigation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Permanent overhead	Portable overhead	Revolving sprinkler	Perforated pipe	Porous hose	Water
Onions	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost,	\$ 8.50	\$ 9.95	\$ 9.95	\$ 9.95	\$ 10.95	\$ 10.65	\$ 10.90	\$ 9.10	\$ 10.00	9
	P.A.I. Com.Net	8.57	2.52	2.32	2.39	6.28	5.69	4.26	3.72	3.19	
	P.A.I. Com.Net.	.07	7.43	7.63	7.56	4.67	4.96	6.64	5.38	6.81	
	P.A.	.63	66.87	68.67	68.04	42.03	44.64	59.76	48.42	61.29	
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.77	1.80	1.61	1.69	5.54	4.92	3.49	3.04	2.57	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	1.73	8.15	8.34	8.26	5.41	5.73	7.41	6.06	7.43	
	K.G.Net P.A.	15.57	73.55	75.06	74.34	48.69	51.57	66.69	54.54	66.87	
	Gross P.A.I.	8.40	11.00			11.40	11.00	11.20	10.90	11.00	
	Com.Cost P.A.I.	10.55	3.10			7.73	7.00	5.24	4.58	3.93	
String beans	Com.Net P.A.I.	-2.15	7.90			3.67	4.00	5.96	6.32	7.07	7
	Com.Net P.A.	-15.05	55.30			25.69	28.00	41.72	44.24	49.49	
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	8.33	2.22			6.81	5.95	4.30	3.74	3.16	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	.07	8.78			4.59	5.05	6.90	7.16	7.84	
	K.G.Net P.A.	.49	61.46			32.13	35.35	48.30	50.12	54.88	

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

[illegible]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Year	Month	Day	Time	Location	Event	Remarks
1900	Jan	1	10:00	St. Paul	Christmas Eve	First service
1900	Jan	2	10:00	St. Paul	Christmas Day	Second service
1900	Jan	3	10:00	St. Paul	Boxing Day	Third service
1900	Jan	4	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Fourth service
1900	Jan	5	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Fifth service
1900	Jan	6	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Sixth service
1900	Jan	7	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Seventh service
1900	Jan	8	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Eighth service
1900	Jan	9	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Ninth service
1900	Jan	10	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Tenth service
1900	Jan	11	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Eleventh service
1900	Jan	12	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twelfth service
1900	Jan	13	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Thirteenth service
1900	Jan	14	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Fourteenth service
1900	Jan	15	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Fifteenth service
1900	Jan	16	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Sixteenth service
1900	Jan	17	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Seventeenth service
1900	Jan	18	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Eighteenth service
1900	Jan	19	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Nineteenth service
1900	Jan	20	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twentieth service
1900	Jan	21	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-first service
1900	Jan	22	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-second service
1900	Jan	23	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-third service
1900	Jan	24	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-fourth service
1900	Jan	25	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-fifth service
1900	Jan	26	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-sixth service
1900	Jan	27	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-seventh service
1900	Jan	28	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-eighth service
1900	Jan	29	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Twenty-ninth service
1900	Jan	30	10:00	St. Paul	Epiphany	Thirtieth service

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

Crop	Designation of figures	Sub-irrigation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Portable pump over-head	Revolving sprinkler	Perforated pipe	Porous hose	Water
Corn	Gross, P.A.I. Con.Cost	.50	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00			\$ 2.35	\$ 2.25	
	P.A.I. Con.Net	8.57	2.52	2.32	2.39			3.72	3.19	
	P.A.I.	-8.07	2.52	-32	-39			-1.37	-.94	
	Con.Net P.A.	-72.63	-4.68	-2.88	-3.51			-12.33	-8.46	9
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.77	1.80	1.61	1.69			3.04	2.57	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	-6.27	.20	.39	.31			-.69	-.32	
	K.G.Net P.A.	-56.43	1.80	3.51	2.79			-6.21	-2.88	
	Gross, P.A.I. Con.Cost	6.16	6.00	5.90	5.90	\$ 6.30	\$ 6.30	4.00	5.50	
	P.A.I. Con.Net	7.82	2.30	2.12	2.18	5.19	3.89	3.39	1.91	
Muskmelon	P.A.I. Con.Net	-1.66	3.70	3.78	3.72	1.06	2.41	.61	2.59	
	P.A.	-16.60	37.00	37.80	37.20	10.60	24.10	6.10	25.90	10
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.18	1.64	1.47	1.54	4.49	3.18	2.77	2.34	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	-.02	4.36	4.43	4.36	1.76	3.12	1.23	3.16	
	K.G.Net P.A.	-.20	43.60	44.30	43.60	17.60	31.20	12.30	31.60	

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation
(Continued)

Crop	Designa- tion of figures	Sub-irri- gation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Perma- nent over- head	Portable over- head	Revolv- ing sprink- ler	Perfora- ted pipe	Porous hose	Water
Sweet potato	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost	\$ 5.80	\$ 6.05	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.10	\$ 6.20	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.60	10
	P.A.I. Com.Net	7.82	2.30	2.12	2.18	5.73	5.19	3.89	3.39	2.91	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	-2.02	3.75	3.88	3.82	.47	.91	2.31	1.61	2.69	
	P.A.	-20.20	37.50	38.80	38.20	4.70	9.10	23.10	16.10	26.90	
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.18	1.64	1.47	1.54	5.05	4.49	3.18	2.77	2.34	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	-.38	4.41	4.53	4.46	1.15	1.61	3.02	2.23	3.26	
	K.G.Net P.A.	-3.80	44.10	45.30	44.60	11.50	16.10	30.20	22.30	32.60	
	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost	7.00	15.80	14.00	14.00	18.00	17.70	17.90	14.00	16.40	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	8.57	2.52	2.32	2.39	6.28	5.69	4.56	3.72	3.19	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	-1.57	13.28	11.68	11.61	11.72	12.01	13.46	10.28	13.21	
Strawberries	P.A.	-14.13	119.52	105.12	104.49	105.48	108.09	122.76	92.52	118.89	9
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.77	1.80	1.61	1.69	5.54	4.92	3.49	3.04	2.57	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	.23	14.00	12.39	12.31	12.46	12.78	14.41	10.96	13.83	
	K.G.Net P.A.	2.07	126.00	111.51	110.79	112.14	115.02	129.69	98.64	124.47	

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation (Continued)

Crop	Designa- tion of figures	Sub-irri- gation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Perma- nent over- head	Portable over- head	Revolv- ing sprink- ler	Perfora- ted pipe	Porous hose	Water
Raspberries	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost.	\$ 6.00	\$ 11.00	\$ 10.75	\$ 10.75	\$ 12.30	\$ 11.90	\$ 12.20	\$ 11.00	\$ 11.80	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	7.82	2.30	2.12	2.18	5.73	5.19	3.89	3.39	2.91	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	-1.82	8.70	8.63	8.56	6.57	6.71	8.31	7.61	8.89	
	P.A.	-13.20	87.00	86.30	85.60	65.70	67.10	83.10	76.10	88.90	10
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	6.18	1.64	1.47	1.54	5.05	4.49	3.18	2.77	2.34	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	-1.18	9.36	9.28	9.21	7.25	7.41	9.02	8.23	9.46	
	K.G.Net P.A.	-1.80	93.60	92.80	92.10	72.50	74.10	90.20	82.30	94.60	
	Gross, P.A.I. Com.Cost	2.15				2.20	2.10	2.20	1.90	2.15	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	6.65				4.87	4.41	3.30	2.89	2.47	
	P.A.I. Com.Net	-4.50				-2.67	-2.31	-1.10	-.99	-.32	
Alfalfa	P.A.	-54.00				-32.04	-27.72	-13.20	-11.88	-3.84	12
	K.G.Cost P.A.I.	5.25				4.30	3.82	2.71	2.36	1.99	
	K.G.Net P.A.I.	-3.10				-2.10	-1.72	-.51	-.46	.16	
	K.G.Net P.A.	-37.20				-25.20	-20.64	-6.12	-5.52	1.92	

Returns From Supplemental Irrigation
(Continued)

Crop	Designa- tion of figures	Sub-irri- gation	Furrow	Border	Flood	Farm- ment over- head	Portable over- head	Revolv- ing sprink- ler	Perfor- ated pipe	Porous tile	Water
Apples	Gross, P.A.I. Con.Cost		\$ 6.50	\$ 6.60	\$ 6.60				\$ 6.50	\$ 6.50	12
	P.A.I. Con.Net		1.93	1.80	1.85				2.89	2.47	
	P.A.I. Con.Net		4.57	4.80	4.75				3.61	4.03	
	P.A. Con.Net		54.84	57.60	57.00				43.32	45.36	
	P.A.										
	K.G.Cost P.A.I. K.G.Net		1.40	1.25	1.21				2.36	1.99	
	P.A.I. K.G.Net		5.10	5.35	5.29				4.14	4.51	
	P.A. K.G.Net		61.20	64.20	63.48				49.68	54.12	
	P.A.										
Averages	Gross, P.A.I. Con.Cost	6.90	7.75	7.25	7.24	\$ 9.00	\$ 8.74	\$ 8.94	7.20	7.85	9
	P.A.I. Con.Net	8.89	2.52	2.35	2.42	6.53	5.91	4.44	3.75	3.27	
	P.A.I. Con.Net	-1.99	5.13	4.90	4.82	2.47	2.83	4.50	3.45	4.58	
	P.A. Con.Net	-15.11	47.05	46.46	46.79	23.54	26.62	38.66	32.57	41.69	
	P.A.										
	K.G.Cost P.A.I. K.G.Net	7.02	1.87	1.63	1.71	5.76	5.09	3.64	3.06	2.63	
	P.A.I. K.G.Net	-1.13	5.88	5.62	5.53	3.24	3.65	5.30	4.14	5.22	
	P.A. K.G.Net	-1.65	53.46	52.81	52.02	30.16	33.67	48.00	38.48	47.79	
	P.A.										

Return From California (Continued)

[illegible]

VII. PROBABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Having analyzed the financial feasibility, load possibilities, and other matters concerning supplemental irrigation, it now remains only to suggest the probable future developments of this very desirable cultivational practice. What distributional systems are likely to be used most? What sections will become the lands of most supplemental irrigation? What overall factors are making for extensive development of the practice? These are some of the questions which should be answered.

A. PRESENT STATUS

Supplemental irrigation so far has received nothing like the attention which it merits. The leading states at this writing are Ohio where there are many small installations for home vegetable gardens and some large ones for orchards, Michigan where there is extensive potato irrigation by the porous hose technique, and New Jersey where numerous truck gardens are watered by the overhead sprinkler system. In the South almost nothing has been done and this is likewise true of New England. During the drought years of the early thirties, the practice was given considerable impetus but since then — because nobody

THE QUESTION OF THE FUTURE OF THE

It is a question which has been discussed for many years, and it is one which will continue to be discussed for many years to come. It is a question which has been discussed in many different ways, and it is one which will continue to be discussed in many different ways for many years to come.

Questions will be asked of the future of the world, and it is one which will continue to be discussed for many years to come. It is a question which has been discussed in many different ways, and it is one which will continue to be discussed in many different ways for many years to come.

THE QUESTION OF THE FUTURE OF THE

Supplemental investigation so far has revealed nothing like the attention which it merits. The leading states of this writing are Ohio where there are many small installations for these vegetable gardens and some large ones for orchards, vineyards, and other fruit growing. In the south of the United States, and New Jersey there are numerous small gardens and watered by the overhead sprinkler system. In the south of the United States, and New Jersey there are numerous small gardens and watered by the overhead sprinkler system. In the south of the United States, and New Jersey there are numerous small gardens and watered by the overhead sprinkler system.

- 118 -

has been enough concerned to "push" strongly -- there has been very little increase. Estimates of supplemental irrigation acreage at present are contained in a table by Staebner:

Estimate of Acres Irrigated

	1931	1936
Minnesota.....	150	895
Wisconsin.....	40	340
Michigan.....	2000	7600
Iowa.....	1000	1000
Illinois.....	250	630
Indiana.....	1756	550
Ohio.....	500	10,000
Delaware.....		10
Pennsylvania.....		300
New York.....		1825
Maryland.....	5700	1150
New Jersey.....		6000
Connecticut.....		355
Massachusetts.....		2000
Rhode Island.....		200
Maine.....		98
Vermont.....		7
Total.....	11,396	33,060

B. FAVORABLE FACTORS

Underlying the long-range course of supplemental irrigation development, there are several fundamental factors which point towards expansion of the practice. In the first place, the tendency of rainfall is to become less and less; this trend will probably continue for a period of years if the predictions of Weather Bureau technicians are to be believed. Secondly agricultural in the long

MAY 1964		JUN 1964	
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31

- 119 -

run will become much more intensive, with many marginal lands put back to forests and many more crops grown on the diminished acreage. Thirdly, the farms of America are becoming increasingly electrified and with this comes the power which makes irrigation possible.

C. SECTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In Chapter III an analysis of sectional potentialities was made in reference to REA load and the same factors apply here are a larger scale. The South will be slow to take up the practice because of low incomes, plentiful rainfall, prevalence of cotton and tobacco farming, etc. The East will probably use the overhead sprinkler and revolving sprinkler systems more and more for truck growing and kitchen gardens. In the mid-West, there is possibility of vast expansion along the lines of irrigation for fruits, corn, table vegetables, potatoes, etc.; porous hose and revolving sprinkler systems will probably be most used. In the "west-of-the-Cascades" section, there will be a few large consumption installations which use the furrow or other surface systems.

D. DISTRIBUTIONAL TECHNIQUES

As hinted above, various distribution systems will probably be used in different sections. The most all-round useful, productive

and will be a most interesting study. The first part of the book is devoted to a description of the various types of rocks which are found in the district. The second part is devoted to a description of the various types of fossils which are found in the district. The third part is devoted to a description of the various types of plants which are found in the district. The fourth part is devoted to a description of the various types of animals which are found in the district.

CHAPTER IV

In Chapter III we have seen that the various types of rocks which are found in the district are all of them of the same age. This is a very important fact, and it is one which will be of great value to us in the study of the district. The first part of the chapter is devoted to a description of the various types of rocks which are found in the district. The second part is devoted to a description of the various types of fossils which are found in the district. The third part is devoted to a description of the various types of plants which are found in the district. The fourth part is devoted to a description of the various types of animals which are found in the district.

CHAPTER V

In Chapter IV we have seen that the various types of rocks which are found in the district are all of them of the same age. This is a very important fact, and it is one which will be of great value to us in the study of the district. The first part of the chapter is devoted to a description of the various types of rocks which are found in the district. The second part is devoted to a description of the various types of fossils which are found in the district. The third part is devoted to a description of the various types of plants which are found in the district. The fourth part is devoted to a description of the various types of animals which are found in the district.

and economical methods, however, seem to be porous hose and revolving sprinkler. The permanent overhead will continue to be used for large truck installations where high-priced vegetables are grown. Surface methods will be applied in orchards and in flat level country where coarser crops, like corn and potatoes are raised. Sub-irrigation -- as the figures in the last chapter plainly showed -- is feasible almost everywhere except for very expensive crops grown on the ideal soil.

E. OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

There are various other trends in this supplemental irrigation business and among them are the following. It is likely that much watering will be done at night -- particularly on the smaller installations -- by having the irrigator turn on the system when he retires and turn it off when he gets up. In the merchandising field there is the development of the "package selling" technique. The increase in kitchen gardens as the nation becomes more and more suburban is likewise important.

and, consequently, the only way to get the
desired results is to make the system
as simple as possible. The system will
be made as simple as possible. The system
will be made as simple as possible. The
system will be made as simple as possible.
The system will be made as simple as possible.
The system will be made as simple as possible.
The system will be made as simple as possible.

2. THE SYSTEM

The system is a simple one. It is a
system of the type which is used in the
business world. It is a system which is
used in the business world. It is a system
which is used in the business world. It is
a system which is used in the business world.
It is a system which is used in the business
world. It is a system which is used in the
business world. It is a system which is
used in the business world. It is a system
which is used in the business world. It is
a system which is used in the business world.

VIII. AN REA PROGRAM

The details of any program which will take advantage of the large potential irrigation load and give the farmers the advantages of supplemental watering, is the business of the Utilization Division. As a concluding section to this paper, however, the broad outlines of such a program are suggested. It is felt that the adoption of some such program would stabilize and increase the load of those many projects which are located in areas favorable to crop-watering.

A. FURTHER RESEARCH

First of all, the organization should get some trial installations on farms in various favorable sections. By this means the load and personal feasibility of the practice could be checked with actual experience. It is suggested that some mid-West states -- like Ohio and Indiana -- be used for this sampling.

On the technical side of the subject, moreover, much more could be done. Now that REA is in Agriculture, it might be possible to have one of the old-line bureaus conduct check-plot experiments. Various methods would be tested for cost, effectiveness, load, durability, etc. Various crops would be tested, also, to see whether or not supplemental water did enough good to merit widespread use. Perhaps some of the student engineers could develop a study of the technical side.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADVANTAGE OF THE

The debate of any program which will take advantage of the

is the business of the Utilization

It is felt that

the

the

the

1. The

First of all, the organization should get some trial install-

tions on farms in various favorable sections. By this means the

the

the

like Ohio and Indiana -- be used for this sampling.

the

the

the

Various methods would be tested for cost, effectiveness, load,

etc. Various crops would be tested, also, to see whether

the

the

the

B. SYSTEMS TO EMPHASIZE

Revolving sprinkler and porous hose seem like the most feasible systems for REA to emphasize in any selling campaign. These methods are both inexpensive and efficient and are good for both small and large installations. They have, also, a portable feature which works in well with crop rotation and with stretching applications out over a period of days.

In the beginning, it should be mentioned, REA should go after numerous small installations. These are easier to "sell" than the big ones and use just as much current. The small installations, moreover, fit in well with the plumbing campaign since the same pump and motor can be used for both things. If the kitchen-garden units prove profitable, irrigators will take quickly to the larger commercial installations.

C. LITERATURE

A supplemental irrigation plan should proceed along the same lines as pest utilization campaigns, as far as the publications phase is concerned. There might well be articles in the RE News and various four-page leaflets. Also, a manual for project superintendents — such as was issued for the brooder campaign — also would be very helpful. The News articles could very well begin at once.

INSTALLATION

from the pump house into the main

line. The pump house is located at the

main line and is a small building with a good

view of the main line. They have, also, a por-

table which is used for the purpose of

the pump house. The pump house is located

at the main line and is a small building

after numerous small installations. These are easier to "sell"

than the big ones and use just as much current. The small in-

stallations, however, are not as profitable as the

since the same pump and motor can be used for both things.

It is the intention of the company to install

the pump house at the main line.

CONCLUSION

A small building at the main line and a

table which is used for the purpose of

the pump house. The pump house is located

at the main line and is a small building

after numerous small installations. These are easier to "sell"

than the big ones and use just as much current. The small in-

D. PURCHASING

Since supplemental irrigation requires considerable initial expenditure, some financing plan will be necessary in most cases. Loans to the cooperatives and thence to the members -- as is done for wiring and plumbing -- would be entirely feasible. REA may not have to do this directly, however, for the E.F.H.A. is expressly set up for such loans.

Another feature of the purchasing angle should be cooperative buying. Systems like the overhead and revolving sprinkler are made by wide-awake business concerns and they doubtless would give considerable reduction for large orders. Project superintendents would be asked to sign twenty members for similar units of kitchen-garden size and then would put in the order as one demand.

Another purchasing stimulant would come from emphasis on the package merchandising idea. Some revolving-sprinkler manufacturers are already selling their products in this manner and REA might be able to urge others into doing the same things. Installations would come to the farmer ready for easy assembly without the necessity of engineering advise.

E. MISCELLANEOUS

Other phases of the program would be many. Field repre-

D. FURNISHING

Since supplemental irrigation requires considerable initial expenditure, some financing plan will be necessary in most cases. Loans to the cooperatives and thence to the members -- as is done for wiring and plumbing -- would be entirely feasible. REA may not have to do this directly, however, for the R.E.A. is expressly set up for such loans.

Another feature of the purchasing angle should be cooperative buying. Systems like the overhead and revolving sprinkler are made by side-arms business concerns and they doubtless would give considerable reduction for large orders. Project superintendents would be asked to sign twenty members for similar units of kitchen-garden size and then would put in the order as one demand.

Another purchasing standpoint would come from emphasis on the package merchandising idea. Some revolving-sprinkler manufacturers are already selling their products in this manner and REA might be able to urge others into doing the same thing. Installations would come to the farmer ready for easy assembly without the necessity of engineering advice.

E. MISCELLANEOUS

Other phases of the program would be many. Field rep-

- 124 -

representatives should be asked to feature supplemental irrigation in their talks with superintendents and directors. Assistance might be had from numerous other agencies in the Department of Agriculture, extension agents for example. Certain areas should be picked for extensive "selling", like the Iowa range campaign, etc. By doing the things suggested above and others, REA might in several years increase the load of its projects by more than ten per cent and increase to income of irrigating members by a like or greater amount.

representatives should be asked to furnish supplementary information in their talks with superintendents and directors. Assistance might be had from numerous other agencies in the Department of Agriculture, extension agents for example. Certain areas should be picked for extensive "selling", like the Iowa range campaign, etc. By doing the things suggested above and others, NEA might in several years increase the load of its projects by more than ten per cent and increase its income of irrigating members by a like or greater amount.

During the past few years the NEA has been working on a plan to increase its membership and income. This plan is based on the fact that the NEA has a large number of members who are not active in the organization. These members are known as "inactive" members. The NEA has been working to bring these members back into the organization by offering them various incentives. These incentives include the opportunity to participate in the NEA's various projects, the opportunity to receive NEA publications, and the opportunity to receive NEA services. The NEA has also been working to increase its income by offering various services to its members. These services include the opportunity to purchase NEA products, the opportunity to receive NEA services, and the opportunity to receive NEA services.

The NEA has been working to increase its membership and income by offering various incentives to its members. These incentives include the opportunity to participate in the NEA's various projects, the opportunity to receive NEA publications, and the opportunity to receive NEA services. The NEA has also been working to increase its income by offering various services to its members. These services include the opportunity to purchase NEA products, the opportunity to receive NEA services, and the opportunity to receive NEA services.

The NEA has been working to increase its membership and income by offering various incentives to its members. These incentives include the opportunity to participate in the NEA's various projects, the opportunity to receive NEA publications, and the opportunity to receive NEA services. The NEA has also been working to increase its income by offering various services to its members. These services include the opportunity to purchase NEA products, the opportunity to receive NEA services, and the opportunity to receive NEA services.